1	
2	
3	IN RE THE MEETING OF THE )
4	BAY-DELTA ADVISORY COUNCIL )
5	
6	
7	
8	TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
9	
LO	
L1	Sacramento Convention Center 13th and K Streets, Room 204
L2	Sacramento, California 95814
L3	
L4	Friday, July 19, 1996 at 10:06 a.m.
L5	
L6	
L7	
L8	
L9	
20	REPORTED BY: SUSAN PORTALE, CSR NO. 4095, RPR, CM
21	
22	
23	PORTALE & ASSOCIATES DEPOSITION REPORTERS
24	211 East Weber Avenue Stockton, California 95202

PORTALE & ASSOCIATES (209) 462-3377

1	COUNCIL MEMBERS:			
2	MICHAEL MADIGAN, Chairman, California Water			
3	Commission			
4	LESTER SNOW, Executive Director			
5	SUNNE McPEAK, Bay Area Economic Forum			
6	ERIC HASSELTINE, Contra Costa Council			
7	STEVE HALL, Association of California Water			
8	Agencies			
9	JACK FOLEY, Metropolitan Water District of			
LO	Southern California			
L1	ALEX HILDEBRAND, South Delta Water Agency			
.2	TOM MADDOCK, California Chamber of Commerce			
L3	BOB RAAB, Save San Francisco Bay Association			
L <b>4</b>	RICHARD IZMIRIAN, California Sportfishing			
L5	Protection Alliance			
L6	DON BRANSFORD, Glenn-Colusa Irrigation District			
L7	ROGER STRELOW, Beveridge & Diamond			
L8	ROSEMARY KAMEI, Santa Clara Valley Water			
L9	District			
20	DAVID GUY, California Farm Bureau Federation			
21	TOM GRAFF, Environmental Defense Fund			
22	JUDITH REDMOND, Community Alliance with Family			
23	Farmers			
24	ROGER THOMAS, Golden Gate Fishermen's			
25	Association			

PORTALE & ASSOCIATES (209) 462-3377

1	COUNCIL MEMBERS: (cont'd)				
2	ROBERTA BORGONOVO, League of Women Voters				
3	TIB BELZA, Northern California Water Association				
4	MARY SELKIRK, East Bay Municipal Utility				
5	District				
6	ROGER PATTERSON, Designated Federal Official -				
7	Bureau of Reclamation				
8	MARCIA SABLAN, City of Firebaugh				
9	ANN NOTTOFF, Natural Resources Defense Council				
10	MICHAEL MANTELL, Designated State Official - The				
11	Resources Agency				
12	MIKE McDONALD, Northern California Power Agency				
13	HOWARD FRICK, Friant Water Authority/Arvin				
14	Edison Water Supply District				
15	STUART PYLE, Kern County Water Agency				
16	00				
17					
18					
19					
20					
21					
22					
23					
24					
25					

(All parties present, the following proceedings were had at 10:06 a.m.:)

CHAIRMAN MADIGAN: Good morning.

It's ten a.m. We are nearly all here.

Thank you for your prompt attendance.

We have a big day ahead of us. This is the noticed meeting of the Bay Delta Advisory Council for Friday, July 19th, 1996.

It's nice to see all of you.

We have some housekeeping items that I want to take care of before we get started on the meat of the day.

For those of you in the audience who are wondering what the material is that the BDAC members are looking at, because the BDAC members received this stuff last week, there are copies of the material out in front at the registration table and it's certainly available to you.

Again, for members of the BDAC, lunch will be served downstairs. We will try to break pretty promptly around noon and for the members of the general public there are certainly a number of restaurants right close by.

As I would expect it there will be a fair amount of public comment today.

Let me review the ground rules.

The BDAC is going to deliberate on each of the

PORTALE & ASSOCIATES (209) 462-3377

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

13

14

15

16

Page 5

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

23

25

1

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

individual issues and then it's my intention to provide an 2 opportunity for public comment on each of those individual 3 items.

If you would fill out a speaker's card at the registration table so that we have your name spelled correctly and your address and we know how to haunt and harass you in the evenings, it would be helpful.

It's possible that I will ask you to restrict the length of your comments depending on how much other discussion we have on items today so that we can conclude this day in a reasonably timely manner.

12 You are, nevertheless, encouraged to speak on 13 those items after BDAC conversation.

In addition to that, as always, there will be a public comment period at the end of this meeting, and you are invited to speak at that time as well.

Three to five minutes is an appropriate kind of time frame in my mind for that.

Again, if you have not filled out a speaker's card for an individual item, we would ask that you sign up for that purpose so that those of us up here have a record of your intentions.

23 It would be helpful if you would sign up prior 24 to lunch so that we have some idea as to the amount of time 25 that we will take at the end of the meeting for that public

always desirable for us to have something that approximates

- 2 consensus in our concerns, that it will not always be
- possible to do that and that's okay, and I'll certainly
- 4 call on Mr. Patterson and Mr. Mantell, as we get into that
- 5 phase, and they can express to you as well their hopes and
- 6 aspirations for the comments that you are being asked to 7 provide today.

All right. Having said all of that -- Mike Stearns isn't able to join us today and he's asked Dan Nelson to be here instead.

Dan, it's nice to see you again. Your comments and your views today are important so please feel free to let us know what we ought to know and there are some issues today I am aware that are of particular concern to you all.

DAN NELSON: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN MADIGAN: So we look forward to it and appreciate the fact that you've taken the time to come by.

DAN NELSON: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN MADIGAN: Overview of process and

21 progress. 22

Mr. Snow, you're on.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SNOW: Thank you,

24 Mr. Chair, members of the committee.

I want to give kind of a quick overview of the

Page 6

1 comment period.

> The next meeting of the BDAC is going to be on Friday, September 20th, and currently the meeting after that is scheduled for Thursday, November 21st.

The locations have not yet been identified, at least to my knowledge, and that information will be sent out to you as soon as possible.

Again, to those of you on the BDAC, while we will do our very best today, and, as you can see, we are set up to record your comments and those comments will be -- I hope will be in agreeable enough form by the end of 12 the day that they can be appropriately summarized in writing for the members of CalFed.

Still your comments in writing to this organization remain very, very helpful as it documents your concerns and that's important.

17 Sunne and I both want to remind you all of the 18 importance of being able to get through this Agenda today 19 so that we can move on to the next phase.

20 It's very necessary for us to be able to 21 deliver our comments as advisors to the CalFed process at 22 their meeting on July 29th.

23 So it's just really, really important that as 24 you have issues that you want raised that you bring them up today and I will say from my standpoint that while it is

process that has got us to this point. I want to indicate

2 kind of at the front end of this meeting despite what

3 discussions we get into, just my basic optimism about where

we are in the spirit of the people who are participating in

this effort.

People have come to this process with a lot of different views and often disparate views and nonetheless people have strived to find common ground and work on common solutions, and I think that has been very beneficial to us and I think we are at a point where given a lot of hard work we can move forward and come up with the long-term solution we are charged to do so.

I think some of the kind of evidence of the power of the coalition and cooperation is the passage of SB 900 in the Assembly and the Senate, and we will hear more about that later today from the people who worked hard on that late nights to get that done.

Also, I would report briefly, even though we'll discuss it in a little more detail later, the last Workshop that we had, Workshop 7, in my mind was a very rewarding Workshop.

We had a very good turnout and we saw people coming in very focused, focused on the issues that were really important to them, the changes they wanted to see or the things in the program they want to emphasize.

Page 8

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Page 11

Page 12

Page 9

We also have seen increased interest in a program of looking at the policy nuances, the way that we worked things.

People are really starting to pay attention to policy definition and sending us comments striving for better policy definition in the language that we come up with and really trying to ferret out what I would call unintended policy communication.

I mean, people really questioned "Do you mean to say this about agricultural land retirement" or "Do you mean to say this about commercial fishing"?

That's a very beneficial process for us to kind of clarify where we are headed and the words that we are choosing, and one of the kind of curious comments that we've gotten that I think is important to kind of listen to is that people have found our explanation of the program better or more enlightening than some of the written words that we choose and so that has kind of meant to us that we are evolving the program so fast that some of the written communication is not keeping up with the policy discussions that we were having. What that means to us is that incumbent on us now is being able to capture all of that as we get all of these comments and try to turn it into the

With that I want to show you some golden oldie

1 consultants and the inter-agency folks.

We are getting ready for BDAC to provide its advice to Cal-FED.

CalFed in turn will communicate to the Secretary of Interior and to Governor Wilson in terms of where we are at the conclusion of Phase 1.

Kind of to backtrack just a little bit, some of the stuff that we focused on when we got started on this was kind of a changed approach in dealing with these kind of natural resource issues and the first was the issue of State and Federal cooperation collaboration rather than conflict that we've seen in the past.

And as important or perhaps more important was the water community involvement, the fact that everybody's recognizing that we've got something at stake, that everybody needs to work together.

We set out early on in the program that we needed to come up with a lasting solution and in order to do that it needed to be comprehensive in terms of addressing all of the basic issues in the system and it needed to be collaborative to make sure that we are addressing the basic issues in the system.

In approaching that we said we kind of took a promise to have an open process, to try to collaborate with as many people as we could.

Page 10

overheads that have helped guide us through this process.
 They will be collector's items. I know none of you believe
 me now but they will be.

4 CHAIRMAN MADIGAN: Is your autograph on 5 them to make them worth more?

6 Will you be at card shows, things like that?
7 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SNOW: Can you hear me
8 on the system (indicating)?

9 A SPECTATOR: NO.
10 EXECUTIVE DIRECT

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SNOW: How about now?

11 Yes?

13

16

12 CHAIRMAN MADIGAN: Yes.

final draft of the Phase 1 activities.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SNOW: Am I on?

14 Okay. Good.

15 Okay. You know this one (indicating), Calfed

Bay-Delta Program.

17 If that's not familiar to you, you're in the 18 wrong room.

wrong room.
I know you've seen this before, but I think at
this point where we are approaching the end of Phase 1 we

21 kind of need to recap some of what got us here and this is 22 actually fairly important in terms of just remembering the

23 basic structure.

We have been laboring down here kind of in these two boxes working with the public staff work, the Also, we understood that simply fixing a couple of species problems wasn't going to be enough. We had to take a broader based ecosystem approach and we also stipulated at the beginning there would be no preferred options or prohibited options at the start of the program.

Again, kind of the image that we were striving for was trying to piece together the different problem areas and come up with something where the whole system is getting better, not one sector at the expense of another sector.

We laid out the three phase program.

Phase 1 being the problem definition moving through to a short list of alternatives, which then move into Phase II of the Program Level.

Is that a little fuzzy to you guys?

Looks like that's as good as it gets.

Phase II is the Program Level environmental documentation and Phase 3 being Project Level and implementation of the program.

We laid out the six step process, again moving from problem definition through actions, through development of preliminary alternatives, to kind of the Phase 1 conclusion report or what we are calling now the Phase II alternatives.

We went through what actually at times was a

PORTALE & ASSOCIATES DEPOSITION REPORTERS

Page 9 - Page 12

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

in the system.

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18 19

21

Page 15

Page 13

painful exercise of generating all of these different

- 2 starting points of how can you approach this problem, what
- kind of actions can you bundle together, put together 100
- 4 preliminary alternatives, compared them to the solution
- 5 principles and the performance measures, generated the 20
- alternatives that we took to the Workshop and it was at 6 7
- this level of 20 that we started first having the major 8 public input in debate.

We went through refinement as a result of the input that we got from BDAC and the Workshop process generated ten refined alternatives and took those ten out to scoping. That's when we started going around the State in the official scoping process, and took the comments and additional analysis that we had performed and have now produced the three alternatives that were the subject of Workshop 7 and are included in your packet today.

17 One thing I went over at the last BDAC Meeting 18 that I want to reemphasize today because it's so 19 fundamental to the alternative, this is what we went out to 20 scoping with, and each of the major components we had 21 various levels of implementation and the comments that we 22 got from you, the comments that we got from the scoping 23 process was that didn't make any sense basically and people 24 indicated that if you have a program to achieve high level 25 Water Quality, you need to do it for all of the

terms, modest, moderate and extensive levels as you 2 continue to implement each of the common programs.

3 So where that led us was defining the 4 alternatives by the common program and the two variable 5 components and the two variable components are conveyance, 6 how you move water in and around the system and storage 7 components, how you operate and how much storage there is

And so we ended up with the three alternatives, based largely around the existing system, meaning the existing diversion patterns, an alternative based around making modifications to the Delta system, change the way the water flows through the system and a dual system that has modifications to the Delta system combined with an isolated facility, looking at different levels of storage, and we'll go into more detail subsequently on these items.

Now, to jump ahead just a moment so you have some context on kind of the decision that we are making on Phase 1, as we have come up with the Phase II alternatives we initiate the EIR/EIS process to lead to a certified EIR and a record of decision on EIS and move into implementation.

At the same time we continue component refinement so we are constantly getting better components, more detail, more well refined. As we develop the

Page 14

alternatives. You don't match up something that somebody 1 2 likes in one these alternatives with a low performing water

- 3 quality. You need to have a common program, a common
- approach for achieving high level water quality, same with
- 5 ecosystem quality, system vulnerability and what's called 6 reduce to command here which was subsequently changed to
- 7 water use efficiency.

And so that formed the concept of a common program for all of the alternatives where these specific components that used to vary now come together and form kind of a common basis for all of the alternatives.

One of the significance with the common program is they tend to deal with complex issues. It tends to be a subject area where you have opportunity to do priority implementation. If you have a levee program, you go after the worst levees first, the ones that are most important. You can stage the implementation and respond to new information, adaptive management, and you can monitor and adjust the program.

20 That tends to be the characteristics of the common programs.

22 So what that means in terms of the kind of 23 staging, you would look at what used to be called the core 24 actions, become the first level of implementation in the common program, and then you can have -- using the old

Page 16

implementation strategy which you can generally think of 1 are two major components and one being the assurances in the institutional issues and the other being the financial 4 strategy. So all of that is moving forward at the same 5 time.

Just a little bit more of kind of context, where we've been in the last year, these are the different Public Workshops and BDAC meetings that we've held.

We started on June 29th, moving on through to where we are today.

Each of these meetings dealt with basically a different issue in that six phase or six step process that we went through. We tried to parallel to the Workshop process so that you were able to see material that came out of the Workshops and be able to kind of feed off of the information that came from the Workshop process.

So that's all brought us to where we are today, having these draft three alternatives and hopefully moving to a completion report on the Phase 1 effort.

Before I go on to the alternatives, maybe if I'd just pause to see if there is any questions about the basic process that we have undertaken.

> CHAIRMAN MADIGAN: Anybody? (No response) Okay. All right.

PORTALE & ASSOCIATES DEPOSITION REPORTERS

Page 13 - Page 16

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

7

8

9

10

11

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2

3

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Page 19

Page 20

Page 17

1 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SNOW: Okay. 2 Again, we are starting to approach the top of 3 the piano here (indicating) -- or would that be the side, I 4 guess -- of the grand piano?

5 CHAIRMAN MADIGAN: It would be the high 6 notes, anyway.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SNOW: Okay, the high notes. That's a good way to put it.

So it's important, you know, getting up here. We've done a lot of combining of these alternatives. You know, essentially where we are is building off of all of 12 this material that we prepared earlier, refining components 13 and putting them together and ending up -- it's totally 14 coincidental that we only showed three.

We had three to five but -- well, no, actually we picked three so we'd match this graphic. Don't write that down.

As I get into the alternatives -- I think there is a couple of the assumptions that we have highlighted in the packet that are worth noting here because they are real important.

The first one is one that we discussed a long time ago, actually, at a dinner educational briefing when we talked about the hydrographs and the variability between years and that sort of thing, and essentially the

Page 18

assumption here is that the value of water varies by flow rate, time of year, location, and water year type.

And that's a real fundamental issue that particularly the value to the environment of a unit of water varies significantly during the year, and that's important because it means we need to focus diversions when it has the least value to the environment, when it has the least impact.

We need to focus on providing instream flows when it has the most value.

It's in this concept, in this assumption that you can get win-win out of the system, that you can move more water of the system when it's least sensitive, you can return water to the system when it's most needed.

The other basic assumption that underlies this kind of packaging is that restoration of the ecosystem improves not only the species and the functions of the system but also serves to reduce supply constraints.

It's the whole issue of dealing with conflicts in the system and these are very basic assumptions that underlie formation of all of the alternatives.

22 Now, here is kind of another way of showing the 23 basic structure of the alternatives (indicating).

24 They consist of a conveyance, storage and common program. 25

And in alternative one, alternative one is based around the existing system and that means the existing diversion structure of the Delta.

It is combined with looking at different types of storage in the system, upstream storage, south of Delta storage, in-Delta storage and conjunctive use in groundwater banking and then combined with the common programs, the four common programs.

Now, just glancing across here you can see that there is a little relative difference on how the storage is paired with the conveyance in the system and that has to do with how you can optimize the use of storage given how you are moving water through the system and this will be a key issue as we move into Phase II when we analyze this to try to optimize the mixing of storage and the kind of system that you're operating.

Alternative two is a through-Delta modification, again looking at different levels of storage in different parts of the system, with the four common programs.

Alternative three is the dual system, again, coupled with different levels of storage in the common program.

Okay. Alternative one -- and we actually have a map up on the other side (indicating) -- alternative one

1 again is based around existing diversion patterns in the

2 system and existing Delta channels. 3

What is being looked at in that is modifications, minor modifications in the system that could provide conveyance to the export pumps up to the full capacity of the pumps, up to and including the full capacity.

We are looking at again a full range of storage options in the system upstream, south of Delta, in-Delta and conjunctive use in groundwater, combined with water use efficiency program, ecosystem reservation, system integrity and water quality program.

If you look at the map for a moment (indicating), the significance -- boy, that's hard for me to read from here -- the ecosystem program is kind of shown in a very broad area here because there is pockets of intensive activities that you would undertake on tributaries in the Delta but it's spread over a very broad area.

You'll notice in the yellow area, that's kind of the concentration of the system integrity kind of aspects of the program.

We have simply shown the water drops for the different kinds of water quality measures that will be taken throughout the system and that's kind of a backdrop

PORTALE & ASSOCIATES DEPOSITION REPORTERS

Page 17 - Page 20

7

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

8

Page 21 for all of the consideration of conveyance in storage. 1

And in this case conveyance is basically the 2 3 existing system, existing diversions on the upper Sac and 4 the existing channels in terms of moving water through the 5 system.

Storage will be considered in upstream of the Delta, south of Delta and then also consideration of in-Delta storage.

8 9 Alternative two, alternative two is a 10 through-Delta system. It ranges -- in looking at 11 modification of the through-Delta system it ranges from 12 kind of a dredging and improvement of the existing channels 13 to what could be called major channel and island reconfiguration, very broad channels in the system that 14 15 also incorporate habitat.

Those of you who followed the comments that we received as we went through this process, kind of the one end of this, the major change that probably most reflects the urban proposal that came into our process, the urban comments that were submitted.

The other kind of option to be considered in conveyance on through-Delta is whether the through-Delta alternative is screened or unscreened, and there is a couple of different approaches that you can take and we need to look at both of these as we move forward.

friendly and you are not concerned about screening them 2 out, in fact, you want them to come in and they have 3 rearing habitat in the Delta system.

4 So it's kind of two very different approaches 5 to a through-Delta alternative.

And I don't know if Dick wanted to add anything to that, but since he's not paying attention to the Executive Director of the program, then . . .

Oh, never mind, Dick.

Alternative three, that conveyance is the dual system. That is, modification of the Delta channels for a through-Delta flow and evaluation of an isolated component from 5,000 CFs to 15,000 CFs. It can be conceptually represented on this map as a through-Delta configuration with some size of isolated facility.

And, again, the general range that we are setting up for analysis is from 5,000 to 15,000 CFS.

Again, you'll notice evaluation of larger storage because you have different kinds of opportunities with this system with again the same basic configuration of upstream, south of Delta, in-Delta, conjunctive use and groundwater, again, combined with the backdrop of the basic common program water use efficiency, ecosystem, system integrity and water quality programs.

And I haven't made much mention of this but we

Page 22

1 Again, looking at how this conveyance can be 2 coupled with storage to meet the different needs of the 3 program, again, in the four locations, and also the same basic common program on water use, ecosystem, system 4 5 integrity and water quality as shown on the map (indicating). 6 7

The third alternative --

MS. BORGONOVO: Could I just ask a quick

9 question? 10

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SNOW: Sure.

11 MS. BORGONOVO: I just wondered why you considered screened versus unscreened? What is the 12

13 rationale of that?

14 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SNOW: It really

15 represents two different kinds of thoughts on how you go a

through-Delta system. 16

17 What's typically considered when you look at kind of the upper end of the range, I guess I should say 18 19 lower end of the range of dredging the existing channels, 20 is you probably want to screen the diversion off the Sacramento River to keep the fish in the Sacramento River 21

22 moving downstream. 23 One of the thoughts of having the wider -- much

24 wider channels reconfiguring some of the islands and creating habitat is you make the Central Delta fish

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2

9

10

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

discussed it the last time, that these common programs do get adjusted depending on how they kind of fit in with

3 decisions that you make on conveyance of storage. If you have storage in a certain location you 4

5 can have a dramatic impact on ecosystem restoration because it's easier to produce flows at a certain time so it has a 6

7 lot of interrelationships that will have to come out as we

do this analysis. 8

MR. GRAFF: One question.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SNOW: Yes.

11 MR. GRAFF: What acre feet per year do

12 those 5,000 to 15,000 add up to in capacity?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SNOW: You mean if you

assume --

MR. GRAFF: You assume full usage at both levels, lower and upper level.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SNOW: Yeah, I don't have any idea, actually.

MR. GRAFF: That would be something that would be of interest, I think.

And the other question is why is 5,000 the low number?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SNOW: You know, I don't really know why we picked five. It seems like that's kind of the low end of the types of flows that you have in

Page 24

	Page 25	}	Page 27
1	the system.	1	brief description of the four components.
2	Steve, do you want to add anything?	2	Okay. Are you going to start, Steve, with the
3	MR. YAEGER: We've been looking at five as	3	components?
4	being a low since that pretty much equates to the urban	4	MR. YAEGER: Yeah, I guess.
5	drinking water needs. So the 5,000 would be kind of	5	CHAIRMAN MADIGAN: Mr. Yaeger.
6	allocated strictly for urban drinking water and water	6	MR. YAEGER: We are going to walk through
7	quality.	7	the common programs and give you just the highlights. I'm
8	CHAIRMAN MADIGAN: Alex.	8	going to do water quality and levees and then Dick will be
9	MR. HILDEBRAND: Do you mean to suggest	9	talking about ecosystem and Rick Soehrn talking about water
10	that the urbans are actually going to drink that much	10	use efficiency.
11	water?	11	In our water quality Common Program, in general
12	CHAIRMAN MADIGAN: Steve.	12	the program encompasses all of those actions you saw in the
13	MR. YAEGER: I guess I'm a little confused	13	detailed descriptions of the 20 alternatives and the ten
14	as to exactly what your comment means.	14	alternatives.
15	The 5,000 CFS relates on a yearly basis to	15	Under the drainage problem areas it encompasses
16	about the volume of water that's projected for use in the	16	such actions as managing drainage timing to the river,
17	urban service areas.	17	conversion of drainage hot spot lands to conservation
18	MR. HILDEBRAND: So it's urban water use,	18	reserve programs.
19	not urban drinking water.	19	Under urban and industrial we have such actions
20	MR. YAEGER: Correct. It's the total	20	as incentives to manage urban stormwater and watershed
21	urban volume.	21	management.
22	CHAIRMAN MADIGAN: Roberta, did you have a	22	Under mine remediation we have actions, such as
23	question?	23	on-site remediation at the mines and also incentives to
24	MS. BORGONOVO: I really had a	24	provide pollution credits.
25	philosophical question. In looking at all of the	25	Under management of crop protection chemicals
	Page 26		Page 28
1	alternatives I realize that we have this balance that we	1	we have a range of actions, including things like
2	are trying to achieve, but it's as if there is no value for	2	supporting the efforts of the regional Boards and preparing
3	fresh water that flows out to the ocean. So I just hope	3	management plans and supporting the research activities
الما	that as was an thursiah than alternatives, that that can be	۱.	that are asing into the harbinides and marticides area

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

that as we go through those alternatives, that that can be

addressed. 5

6 It turns up in several of the different 7 discussions in some of the water use efficiency, the way in which we talk about the value of conserving water and then 8 9 we talk about going into an unusable sink, which is the ocean, that there is that value, also, of a river that has 10 11 some unrestricted flow.

12 So there is to a certain extent I like the 13 philosophy of the ecosystem restoration, which is to try to take it back to the natural system, but when you look at 14 15 all of the alternatives there are all of these modifications going on in the natural system so I just 16 17 think that that discussion needs to take place as we go 18 through the alternatives. 19 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SNOW: So that is both 20 the issue of natural system but also the specific issue of

outflow. 21 22 MS. BORGONOVO: Exactly. 23 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SNOW: Okay.

24 Any other questions on the alternatives as they are structured because what we want to do now is go on to a

that are going into the herbicides and pesticides area. 5

Under agricultural drainage management we have actions that range from managing the drainage timing, releases to the river, treating ag drainage in wetlands and other types of treatment facilities and also use of stored water to enhance some of the river qualities.

That in a nutshell is the Common Program for water quality.

Under our Levee System Integrity Common Program we have three main elements.

Under the emergency response element we have included such actions as a multi-agency response team to deal with emergencies.

Consistent funding for emergency response, and preparation of emergency response and reclamation plans to deal with the emergency issues.

Under the levee stabilization element we, again, have consistent funding for the levee stabilization projects.

Prioritization schedule for implementation of levee projects, additional flood protection, especially in the North Delta, and some incentives to provide subsidence

PORTALE & ASSOCIATES DEPOSITION REPORTERS

Page 25 - Page 28

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

control measures.

1

7

8

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

25

Under the levee maintenance elements we have consistent funding for maintenance activities on the levees, preparation and development of agreements around standardized maintenance levels for the Delta levees, and providing additional flood capacity in the Delta channels.

That's pretty much what we had to say about those common programs.

9 Dick, do you want to talk a little about 10 ecosystem?

MR. DANIEL: A couple of quick comments about the ecosystem restoration program.

Much of what you've seen before and very little has changed.

I think it's very appropriate to point out to this group in particular that when it's all said and done I think this program will be characterized as the largest ecosystem restoration program that's ever been undertaken in the United States.

It certainly is the most comprehensive, covers the most broad range of habitat types and largest number of species that we've ever endeavored to recover.

23 It's a habitat based program, oriented towards 24 the restoration of ecological functions.

It will deal with large scale habitats in the

Page 31
1 substantial synergy between the ecosystem restoration

2 program and our common programs dealing with water supply,

3 our common programs dealing with levee restoration. There

4 are many opportunities in reworking the levees in the Delta

5 to incorporate habitat and to preserve habitat.

Our water quality efforts will also reflect in benefits to the ecosystem and the efficient use of water will also overlap into the ecosystem program and that we will endeavor to use what water supplies are currently available and those that might be developed in a very official manner.

In general we are very pleased with the way this program has been developed. It's been a very collaborative effort and frankly I'm very excited about it.

CHAIRMAN MADIGAN: Thank you. Tom.

16 MR. MADDOCK: Could you talk a little more about the San Joaquin programs there, Dick?

There has been a lot of discussion.

MR. DANIEL: One of the main problems that we see on the San Joaquin tributaries and the main stem of the San Joaquin below the mouth of the Merced is the degradation of the integrity channel. That's come about as a result of a couple of actions.

One very dramatic change that has occurred in those river channels is very large scale gravel extraction

Page 30

watersheds that feed water supplies into the Delta Estuary.

It will have considerable focus on the main stem Sacramento River in terms of restoration of habitat, screening of unscreened diversions, restoration of spawning gravels and other things.

In the smaller tributaries of the Sacramento River we will be providing restored habitat to those species that are particularly dependent on the tributaries, a good example there would be spring run chinook salmon.

In the Delta itself it involves a comprehensive restoration of Delta channel islands, attached levee habitat, riverine -- shaded riverine habitat, wetlands, screening of diversions in the Delta, and a focus on

restoring instream and downstream flows in areas of critical need and during periods of critical need.

In the greater San Francisco Bay Area, especially in the upper Bay, we are looking to restore considerable acreage of tidal wetlands through the

19 breaching of dikes, in diked Bay land areas.

On the San Joaquin system we have a greater
challenge. Essentially we have to reconstruct the natural
river channel, isolate existing gravel extraction pits from
the main stem of the river and restore a considerable
amount of habitat in that area.

One thing I want to note is that there is

ary. 1 outside of the main bed of the river but adjacent to it,

2 and over time as those gravel projects have gone out of

3 business or depleted their supply, the maintenance of the

4 levees that separate the river channel from the pits that

5 result from gravel extraction have been abandoned and

6 they've degraded and the river has migrated into them.

This results in traps for juvenile fish. It results in warming of the flow of the river. It takes the general integrity of the river in terms of a distinct channel away from the system.

entrance of the mouths of these tributary streams, the river channel has a graded, it has accumulated large amounts of sand and decomposed granite that have come down from the Sierras. It's broadened. It's gotten shallower, it's gotten warmer and the integrity of the stream carrying flood flows for moving fish downstream and it's general productivity has declined.

On the main stem of the San Joaquin below the

So it's a large scale reversal of these quasi-natural processes that have happened, happened in part because of poor maintenance of channels upstream of the Delta, happened in part because of depletion in flows and the inability of the river to flush itself of these sediments.

MR. MADDOCK: So it's the hydraulics?

PORTALE & ASSOCIATES DEPOSITION REPORTERS

Page 29 - Page 32

Page 32

Page 33 1 MR. DANIEL: An awful lot of what has 2 happened in the San Joaquin river system is a result of 3 both large scale depletions of flow for use upstream. 4 CHAIRMAN MADIGAN: Any other questions? 5 Richard. 6 MR. IZMIRIAN: There is a lot of 7 comforting discussion about natural functions, but it seems 8 that the fishery program is highly relying on fisheries. 9 This, of course, doesn't address the problem of 10 entrainment of eggs and larvae. I haven't seen anything 11 specific to that. 12 Can you discuss what may be done there? 13 MR. DANIEL: A couple of areas that we can 14 deal with the entrainment of eggs and larvae which are 15 essentially unscreenable, if you will, realtime monitoring 16 is a key where diversions will be curtailed during distinct

In the Delta itself we are looking for opportunities to consolidate diversions.

and vulnerable to loss.

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

A typical island may have several hundred diversion points on the island that are used at different times of the year for different purposes for different

We think in some cases we can go through with

periods of time when eggs and larvae and moving downstream

The parts of water use efficiency that we have 2 discussed before include urban water conservation, 3 agricultural water conservation, water recycling.

A fourth one that we have talked about a lot is land retirement and it has certainly been the object of a lot of attention in our process.

We heard a lot of concerns during scoping about land retirement.

In looking at land retirement it's obvious that it can have a lot of very significant third party impacts.

And as we've started to look at the options available to us in water use efficiency it's clear that there are some alternatives.

Things like conservation reserve programs where perhaps irrigation districts can look at supplies available to them and make decisions at the local level about rotational fallowing, about changing cropping patterns to crops that use less water, that sort of thing.

And, finally, as we thought about the objectives that a water use efficiency Common Program has to meet for us, and some of these have come out of the discussions at the BDAC water use efficiency work group, two of the most important objectives are local flexibility in water use efficiency, and that we should support local integrated resources planning.

Page 34

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

large scale consolidation so that we are dealing with a fewer number of diversion points. They might be in locations where eggs and larvae are less vulnerable. But it's an inescapable fact that these very

small fishes and the eggs of our fishes are very vulnerable to diversion and we will never be able to totally correct that problem.

CHAIRMAN MADIGAN: Thank you, Dick.

Thank you.

MR. SOEHRN: The last of the four common 10 11 programs is water use efficiency, previously known as 12 demand management. Water use efficiency is a little 13 different from the other common programs in that we'll be 14 taking a common approach to water use efficiency, but it's 15 only one part of what gets us to water supply reliability.

The program also includes possible new conveyance, possible new storage options, that will change the water reliability picture.

And so water use efficiency in a way is sort of the safety valve to help agencies get to the level of reliability that they need to ensure that they can keep their customers happy after they see what kind of conveyance and what kind of storage is available to them after they assess local needs, local conditions, other

supplies that might be available to them.

Page 36

So when we consider all of those things it is 2 much more problematical for us to figure out exactly where land retirement fits in in water use efficiency. It 3 certainly has a place in water quality, but certainly the role of land retirement is going to be much less than it 5 was in some of our ten alternatives where we looked at up 6 7 to up to 800,000 acres of retired land so at this point we 8 are taking a very hard look at land retirement as a water 9 use efficiency method.

Its role it looks like it will be very minimal and I expect that we will get additional advice and input from the BDAC work group on water use efficiency when we take up this part of the subject.

There is one fourth item that I'd like to bring up in terms of water use efficiency, and that is water use efficiency for environmental water uses.

We have stated that when diversions are made for urban water use, for agricultural water use, there is an expectation that that water should be used as efficiently as possible.

And people have pointed out to us and it's a good point that when water is diverted for environmental purposes, such as on refuges, the same sorts of efficiency standards should apply. We should make efficient use of that water as well.

PORTALE & ASSOCIATES DEPOSITION REPORTERS

Page 33 - Page 36

CondenseIt<sup>TM</sup> **BDAC MEETING** Page 37 Page 39 1 So that's where we stand with the water use It's certainly not that at all. There will be a strong 2 efficiency Common Program. 2 level of conservation, how much additional, more aggressive 3 CHAIRMAN MADIGAN: Mary. 3 conservation needs to take place will depend on each 4 MS. SELKIRK: I had a question from the 4 agency's situation. 5 5 explication in the packet that we got today with regard to CHAIRMAN MADIGAN: Roberta, water use efficiency measures. 6 6 MS. BORGONOVO: This is really a follow-up 7 7 At the top of page 35 in reference to to Mary's question, but I'll put it a different way: 8 8 higher -- the possibility that there may be higher levels I think Mary is looking at the top of page 35 9 of conservation and reclamation depending on the -- what 9 where it says "A higher level of conservation and 10 turns out to be the preferred alternative from the CalFed 10 reclamation may be appropriate with the existing system 11 11 program, could you explain that? conveyance compared with the dual Delta conveyance because 12 I didn't understand. I mean, I understand 12 of reduced opportunity to deliver water south to the export 13 empirically that there is going to be a difference in terms 13 uses" but I just want to go to the philosophical question, 14 of Delta flow and exports between alternative one and 14 which is on the bottom of page 37, "Conservation can harden 15 alternative three. 15 water demand reducing opportunities for additional water 16 What I don't understand is in the short or the 16 use reductions during shortages and increasing the need for 17 long-term why that would then call for or imply lower 17 reliability." 18 levels of conservation reclamation in one alternative 18 I guess that's a philosophical point that I 19 versus another. 19 have been disputing in all of my years in water 20 20 MR. SOEHRN: Well, there are sort of two conservation. I understand that when there wasn't real 21 21 steps, two parts to that answer. planning for water use deficiencies through these 22 22 One approach that we are taking with water use conservation measures that when you came into a drought you 23 23 efficiency is that we need to have some sort of assurance used to have a lot of slop in the system and therefore you 24 of a floor level of efficient water use in every sector. 24 could afford to cut back on that use and you didn't affect 25 25 And, for example, in the urban sector we are your customer. Page 38 Page 40 1 looking at something akin to the urban BMP's, perhaps with So I understand that but it implies that using 2 some improvements, some refinement, greater implementation, 2 water more efficiently increases the need for reliability 3 3 which says to me that it's not as a reliable a source and I some agencies haven't signed the MOU and so forth. 4 As I mentioned earlier, there are a lot of 4 guess the whole point that many of us who are in water 5 different elements of water supply and water supply 5 conservation have been making is that if you are able to show that you can reduce your demand at the customer level, 6 reliability for an agency. 6 7 Export water supplies that might be available 7 that it is -- has the same reliability as the supply so 8 to them from elsewhere and how well that water can be 8 it's not going to reduce your reliability if you plan for 9 9 conveyed across the Delta, local supplies that may be 10 10 Now, you do have to plan for it, but that available to them, either surface or groundwater, water 11 recycling opportunities that are available to them, and, 11 philosophical idea crops up over and over again and I think 12 12 it goes back to the top of page 35, which says that there finally, water conservation water use efficiency. 13 13 is no value in reducing water use at the customer level. An agency is going to have to put all of these 14 14 things together when they figure out what level of And I guess I see a real value, especially to 15 reliability they need for their service area and how they 15 the environment because that says to me you are going to have to take less water out of the stream and, therefore, 16 16 can put all of these components together to get it. 17 17 So the approach that we are taking is that you are going to have less environmental impacts. 18 18 CHAIRMAN MADIGAN: Sunne. we'll need to devise assurances so that there is a strong 19 19 MS. MCPEAK: Trying to listen and

PORTALE & ASSOCIATES DEPOSITION REPORTERS

minimum level of conservation of efficiency that takes

place in each sector and beyond that local agencies will be

So it's not a situation where, well, if we have

able to rely on integrated resources planning to see what

a lot of water that we can develop and convey across the

Delta, agencies south of the Delta won't need to conserve.

additional role conservation has for them.

20

21

22

23

24

Page 37 - Page 40

understand what Roberta is saying, perhaps part of the

and the way you used it I agreed with initially, but if

you are using it is the accuracy of the yield.

problem is that the word reliability in the way you used it

Roberta is disagreeing with it, I wanted to listen closely.

The real implication of the term reliability as

20

21

22

23

24

25

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

8

Page 43

Page 41

1 Because we've got a lot of -- there is a lot of 2 latitude and when we forecast supplies and what will the yield be from certain storage facilities and that then is 4 also a component of reliability.

I think what you are implying is whatever it is and that's as reliable under efficient water use or inefficient water use, right, Roberta?

MS. BORGONOVO: Exactly.

MS. MCPEAK: Okay.

MS. BORGONOVO: If you know quantify it and you know it's in the yield, you can plan for it and you 12 can plan for it also in your drought years when you know you are not going to have that great flexibility you had at 14 the customer level.

Nevertheless, in several of the studies that have been done on demand hardening, one of which was put out both by the California-Urban water agencies and California-Urban Water Conservation Council, we spent a lot 18 of time on demand hardening and the overall conclusion is that you were still better off having to reduce water use because again in the long run it will help your reliability.

And that keeps cropping up here, and I understand the point that the water agencies are making but when I read it it says to me "You have a real price to pay

well, here is an opportunity to not have to worry about 2 water conservation. You go for the dual facility. You see 3 the way in which it's put out there. That's what worries 4 me.

That has been a concept that's been out here before, and we've discussed it before.

7 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SNOW: Maybe if I could 8 address that issue on the top of page 35.

I mean, I think that's one of those types of issues that I brought up at the beginning of the meeting in terms of perhaps our written language not tracking what the underlying policy is.

And I think that the essence of what's being conveyed in that sentence is not as much the issue that you're concerned about but rather this linkage between water use efficiency and market transfers, which we have not explicitly discussed.

But what happens when you modify the system is you open up market incentives more and so market incentives start driving water use efficiency issues and that's really what's embodied in that type of sentence and we have not described it very accurately, but as you have a system that creates a market, then all of a sudden you are having market influences drive what's happening with conservation versus the regulatory approach.

Page 42

for water conservation" and I just don't believe that. MS. MCPEAK: I don't think it -- I would

3 agree with you and I would expect that most of us around the table also would embrace that philosophy and that ethic 4

about water efficiency is important for water reliability.

5 6 Perhaps, Lester, you can comment on it. I 7 would just suggest what we need to focus on is the accuracy

of the yield because that's what in the system has had a lot of latitude in the past and the point you are trying to

9 10 make is we are not going to have a margin of error with

11 increased efficiency that causes us to use the supply that

is generated by that efficiency, which is what does happen. 12

That's what we are going to be doing. You have to have the 13

14 efficient water measures even to get through to the point 15 in time when bring on line any other supply facilities, the

16 facilities that might give us some additional supply.

17 I really think what Roberta is raising we would 18 all agree with. We need to focus part of that sentence on

19 the accuracy of the yield.

20 MS. BORGONOVO: Can I just make a

21 follow-up?

25

22 It goes back again to the philosophical 23 question of the level of demand side management or water 24 use efficiency in the alternatives.

And what I read at the top of page 35 is that,

Page 44

And I think we need to develop that more because I think the bottom line needs to be that we are expecting the same ultimate water use efficiency regardless of the system that we are putting in place, the conveyance system.

MS. BORGONOVO: Is it also an issue of flexibility?

Is that part of what that --

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SNOW: Yeah, I think it's the flexibility that then allows the market to take place and then the market gives people an incentive to conserve water because they then can sell it to a water short user somewhere in the system.

And so in the flexible system with more opportunities to move water you have a distinct economic incentive to make the investment for conservation.

In a system with fewer or less flexibility and fewer opportunities conservation or water use efficiency is taking place for a different reason, either a survival reason or a regulatory reason.

And we need to explain that better because there is no way anybody could read that sentence and get that out of it and we need to make sure we have that discussion.

And one of the casualties of the kind of the

Page 4'

Page 48

9

11

17

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

change that we made is that we dropped much of our 2 description of transfers and the role that that plays in 3 market transfers and where it fits into this and we need to 4 get that back into it. 5

CHAIRMAN MADIGAN: Alex.

6 MR. HILDEBRAND: One facet of this 7 contrast between through-Delta and the isolated facility 8 options is that it's been assumed here that practically all of the new storage opportunities are north of the Delta 10 other than off stream.

That's not entirely true. There is a 12 substantial opportunity to increase the yield out of the 13 upper basin of the San Joaquin by raising Friant and there 14 is also substantial opportunity to increase the yield of 15 the Kings River system and you don't even have to flood 16 further upstream than Pine Flat to do it because there is a tributary of the Kings that comes in below Pine Flat. It's 18 possible to build a dam there of comparable size to Pine Flat and tie the two together so that they act as a large increase in the storage.

And so granted that those yields may not be accumulated as great as some of the opportunities of the Sacramento. It's water that doesn't have to come across the Delta, it doesn't have to be pumped south. It's water that now causes flood damage.

Page 45

Two areas in particular.

Clarifications that people felt we needed to make before we went into Phase II. There is a set of those in your packet.

And then issues of concern that need to be analyzed during Phase II, which is also described in your packet. So I'm just going to walk through some of these issues for you in the next couple of minutes.

Some participants thought that the common programs were intended to be exactly the same for all the alternatives. So what we understand that we need to make it more clear that some variations to the common programs may be needed by the different alternatives.

So we understand that we need to clarify that.

A lot of folks asked us what happened to the old core actions, a term that we had been using for the last several months as part of our alternatives discussions.

The Workshop packet was not particularly clear on that and we need to make it clear that the common programs now include the core actions.

There were a number of questions about concerns that the draft phasing discussions seemed to show the water supply projects occurring too late in program implementations, water supply projects generally require

Page 46

And so I think more attention should be given to that opportunity.

CHAIRMAN MADIGAN: Lester.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SNOW: Actually, as a result largely of Alex's concerns we have changed the way we talk about storage. We used to talk about storage as north of the Delta, south of the Delta, in-Delta.

We have changed north of the Delta to upstream and by doing so that not only then is the Sacramento River but also the San Joaquin and so whenever you see on any of our descriptions of the alternatives the phrase upstream storage it refers to those opportunities upstream on both major river systems. So it includes the Sac Valley, as well as those San Joaquin opportunities that Alex just articulated.

15 16 CHAIRMAN MADIGAN: Is that it, Rick? Is 17 that it?

18 MR. SOEHRN: Yes.

19 CHAIRMAN MADIGAN: Judy.

20 MS. KELLEY: Okay. I am going to spend 21

just a couple of minutes in going over the information that 22 was included in your packet under the section "Workshop 7

23 Key Outcomes" and to reiterate and what Lester said earlier 24 we did have a very successful Workshop and there were a

number of things that came out of it.

many years to develop, but at least in the planning design 2 phase should start in Phase 1.

So a revised phasing plan will be prepared for each alternative which clarifies that issue.

Another clarification for us is priorities for water storage will need to be developed. Some participants thought that priorities for water storage had been set too early before analysis could give them all a fair evaluation.

Now we know that priorities for water storage will be developed and we will make that more clear in subsequent write-ups.

Temporary and permanent land conversion are not methods for improving water use efficiency.

We've had many discussions, both internally and externally about this specific point.

Many participants pointed out that land conversion may be a method to manage overall water supplies, but it should not be considered a method to use water more efficiently. The BDAC work group for water use efficiency will also consider how land conversion can best be utilized to meet the water reliability objectives of the program.

Temporary and permanent land conversions may not be methods for improving water use efficiency. This is

PORTALE & ASSOCIATES DEPOSITION REPORTERS

Page 45 - Page 48

an important discussion that will go on both in the work 1 2 group and here in the larger Council discussions. 3 Realtime monitoring has the potential for 4 improving water diversion timing but not -- but the 5 technique is still experimental. 6 A lot of discussions about the applicability of 7 realtime monitoring. 8 Lots of folks felt that there was some good 9 history on our ability to use information coming out of 10 realtime monitoring and other people were sort of concerned 11 that it's not really a proven technique at this point and 11 12 we don't want to overly rely on it. So realtime monitoring 12 13 has the potential for significantly improving water 13 14 diversion time but the technique is still experimental and 14 15 we need to make that clear in our deliberations and 15 16 discussions. 16 17 A few more areas where we needed further 17 18 clarification. 18 19 System improvements will create new water 19 supply opportunities for all beneficial uses including 20 20 21 ecosystem needs and consumptive uses. 21 22 Just to clarify about water supply improvements 22 23 will apply to all areas of our program and not benefit one 23 24 24 particular area or another. 25 Improved fish screening is included in the 25 Page 50 1 common ecosystem restoration program for each alternative. 1 The potential for fish screenings associated 2 2 3 with new Delta conveyance was discussed in the preliminary 4 alternatives, but it was not clear that significant fish 5 screening of existing diversions is also part of each 6 alternative 6

concerns and that is likely to take place in the assurances 1 2 and guarantees discussions. That we need to include 3 watershed management in the water quality program for each 4 alternative. 5 Again, that we need to develop fish screening 6 criteria and priorities. 7 And develop a more detailed phasing concept, as 8 I mentioned a moment ago. 9 Also, the concept of adaptive management and 10 its potential utility for us is one that was brought up several times.

And the -- clearly the important thing here for us is to devise a strategy for this, help to determine exactly what we mean by adaptive management and then how it would be applied as an important tool on each of these alternatives. So these are some of the areas of very important issues and clarifications that we did get out of the last Workshop. And then in addition to the Workshop

discussions we had a meeting with the inter-agency team where a couple of these issues were further discussed and Steve is going to just spend a minute talking about what happened in that meeting. MR. YAEGER: The Agency people after reviewing the comments from the Workshops and looking at

the alternatives essentially focused on these two concerns.

The first concern you've already heard in 3 Judy's presentation came out in the Workshops, but it was 4 again expressed in the Agency review because it's a really 5 important issue, that is, fish screening criteria and

The difficulty at this point is that many of the agencies, resource agencies that have regulatory responsibilities in fisheries, have somewhat different criteria for fish screening facilities.

priorities.

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

So it's been pointed out to us that if our program intends to address the screening issues on small diversions throughout the system as well as proposed alternatives that have large screening facilities on the Sacramento River diversion or proposes to do large scale improvements at existing pumping plants in the South Delta, that we need a consolidated set of criteria in which to address those facilities.

So this will be a high priority for us in Phase II, and, in fact, that effort has been underway for several months at an inter-agency group trying to craft a uniform set of screening criteria.

The second issue is one more of clarification I think than a Phase II work that's needed.

And the concern there was the way that we had

Improved fish screening is included in the common ecosystem restoration program now contemplated.

Relationships with other ongoing programs and projects in the Bay Delta system will be defined.

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

That was an area that much of our documentation was largely silent on and we will need to do a better job of describing how this important effort will integrate into other very important efforts that are already underway.

So those were some of the key issues that people brought forward that we understand needed fairly immediate clarification.

Another part of the discussion as part of a Workshop were those issues that are not right for perhaps full development at this point but certainly need to be considered as part of Phase II analysis.

22 And some of these comments are that we 23 absolutely needed to include a package of assurances and 24 guarantees as part of each alternative. 25

Again, we need to address the area of origin

PORTALE & ASSOCIATES DEPOSITION REPORTERS

Page 49 - Page 52

Page 52

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

described alternative three, the dual conveyance facility. 1 2 If you recall from your literature, we have

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

19

20

21

23

24

indicated that we are going to look at isolated facility capacities from about 5,000 CFs on up to the full pumping capacity of the existing pumping plants in the South Delta.

And, again, that's the existing capacity of the aqueduct south of that which would still constrain the operation to that capacity.

The concern focused around a CEQA/NEPA issue, and, that is, if we wrap the larger facility in with the dual facilities in which we are looking at this full range of capacities, do we not display clearly and forthrightly the benefits and impacts of an isolated canal which matches the capacity of the existing plants.

There was some concern that by putting it in a package with a set of analyses across the board that those benefits and impacts would be lost in the large matrix of analysis.

I think our view on that is that there is that opportunity to display benefits and impacts. For each of those facilities we will make a special effort to make sure that they are displayed and highlighted in a way that gives full disclosure about impacts and benefits for not only the smaller isolated canal but on up to the full size, 15,000 CFS isolated canal.

1 amount of loss in repeated encounters with fish screens can 2 increase mortality.

3 Other issues surround some policy sorts of things. At the present time there are differing views on 5 fish screen criteria between resources agencies, Fish and 6 Wildlife Services have got a different approach than does 7 the Department of Fish and Game and the National Marine 8 Fishery Service actually has a third approach.

We think that these can be melded together into a single sort of CalFed policy.

Another concern is which screens do you consult first. These are expensive gadgets. We want to be as efficient as possible and not all diversions have identical impacts whether they are the same size or not. Location, whether it be upstream in the watershed or down in the Delta, and even location in terms of the physical configuration of the river from which they are diverting water. The inside of the bend is different from the outside of the bend and things like that,

A final issue that we are working on is that the assurances or guarantees that if a diverter cooperates with us, puts in an expensive fish screen they will have sufficient shelf life to amortize the investment and that's a serious concern and one that we're taking seriously.

So those are the kinds of issues that we are

Page 54

Those were the two main concerns.

There were some other technical issues that I think were resolved in our Agency review, but that gives you kind of a sense of the Agency team's analysis of the alternatives as they were presented to you.

Are there any questions that we can handle on Judy's issues and the ones I presented, also?

CHAIRMAN MADIGAN: Stu.

MR. PYLE: I wonder, Steve, if you could discuss the fish screening criteria a little more?

Is that a conflict between the capability of 12 presently operating screens, screens that you know how to 13 build and the criteria related to some species some of the 14 times that you believe that you'll have to deal with at new 15 facilities?

16 MR. YAEGER: I'm going to defer to Dick on 17 that. I think maybe Dick can give us a little more detail. 18

MR. DANIEL: There are actually several

issues around fish screens.

One is the physical capability of screening a large diversion, one over 3,000 cubic feet per second, and 22 that's not simply a matter of multiple intakes for your diversion facility where you'd have two or three different screenings because each time juvenile fish encounters a

screen there is a certain amount of damage, a certain

Page 56 dealing with regarding the overall fish screening program.

2 We expect to have considerable progress in the very near 3 future.

CHAIRMAN MADIGAN: David.

MR. GUY: I have a question on what are these -- I am having a hard time understanding I guess what these clarifications mean.

Because, for example, number five, the land conversion, it was my understanding at the last meeting that this was going to happen, that we were going to take the land conversion out of the water use efficiency section and yet we get the Workshop 7 packet, and it's back in there in just a little bit different configuration.

I mean, are these decisions that have been made or what's the status of number five, for example?

MR. YAEGER: I guess maybe I should just explain the context.

We made an effort to not change the alternatives from the time period that they were submitted to the Workshop to the BDAC Meeting.

We felt that it would be confusing not only to the stakeholders but to the BDAC members if we again changed the alternatives.

So the Workshop packet essentially was reproduced in total, and you have it in your packet.

PORTALE & ASSOCIATES DEPOSITION REPORTERS

Page 53 - Page 56

The clarifications are the modifications that 1 2 we have made in our thinking of the alternatives as a result of Workshop 7. So that's the way that you should 3 4 view the way that we are looking at land conversion.

5 MR. GUY: So it's been agreed upon by

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

CalFed staff that these clarifications will in fact be made 6 7 to the next draft?

MR. YAEGER: I think we've agreed that this is our recommendation to BDAC and to CalFed that these modifications been made and presented as the set of alternatives at the CalFed public meeting that will follow.

MR. GUY: Okay. Thank you.

MS. MCPEAK: Mike, if that's the case, just as process it seems to me that's a fairly important issue for us to be engaged in, not simply here that staff's recommending that it happen and we sit here sort of half energized.

I mean, it is either something we are going to concur in, and it's a significant issue or not.

And that's -- I am, I guess, asking for what you would prefer as Chair. As we hear this we could note it and come back and I've got a few other things on the list that I've been just giving you as we go along there.

But I think we should take affirmative action one way or another, take action one way or another on these

Page 57

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23

24

25

the 5,000 CFS capacity that we specified as the lower limit

2 of the range on the dual facility, on the isolated part of

3 the dual facility that we intend to look at and analyze

4 relating to I guess to -- a more specific question is

5 that -- is it appropriate at a lower level to set simply

6 because it's related to urban water, drinking water --

MR. GRAFF: Two questions. One is that the appropriate lower level and two, how do you select the best level? What criteria are you going to develop to pick a number other than, you know, political compromise?

MR. YAEGER: The thinking on the 5,000 capacity, and, again, I should stress, I guess, that that is not a constant capacity. We are not stipulating that a canal, an isolated canal would be flowing at 5,000 CFS year-round. Their operation is going to vary according to hydrologic conditions, according to fisheries conditions.

There will be times in which there are fisheries curtailments in which there will be much less flow in an isolated canal and more of it perhaps will be taken in the through-Delta portion of the facility, and we just need to look at it from a realtime monitoring standpoint to react to fisheries conditions, to react to needs, consumptive needs and so forth. So that's kind of a maximum physical capacity. It may not and probably will not be flowing at that rate year-round.

Page 58

issues and how would you like to approach it because this is clearly one in which we need to have clarification.

3 There shouldn't be any ambiguity about whether or not we

just sat here not understanding or if our silence is

5 construed to acquiescence as it goes forward to the CalFed staff. 6

CHAIRMAN MADIGAN: Silence should only be construed as silence.

I want to bring this up under the framing of our advice to CalFed and I do want to specifically bring this one up. I want to flush this particular partridge because there is a lot of concern that's been expressed to me and others about whether in some fashion or other all of this is anti-ag and I want to clarify that today.

Tom.

MR. GRAFF: I want to go back to the issue that Alex brought up earlier.

When you look at that 5,000 CFS size dual facility and you say that the number is picked because it relates to the total urban use south of the Delta, why is that a relevant consideration?

Are you going to have a situation where you are only delivering water to urban areas?

24 MR. YAEGER: Again, for those of you who 25 didn't hear the question, the question was again related to Page 60

2 and there is no absolute reason that we couldn't look at 3 something lower than that but that's one that has been talked about historically. It's related to delivery 5 scenarios that react to urban needs south of the Delta, and 6 in our mind I think it can really address a lot of the 7 urban drinking water quality issues through different 8 operational scenarios you would use on the aqueducts south 9 of the Delta.

But, again, we selected that particular level

CHAIRMAN MADIGAN: Jack. MR. FOLEY: Steve, I look at that issue as one of a design issue.

When you build a system to accommodate movement of water or what have you, you are going to look at perhaps a peak, and that -- you know, 5,000 CFS is running every second every day of the year, it would probably be three million acre feet or something of that range if you work it

That doesn't mean you are going to run 5,000 CFS every second every day. You don't want to constrain your design of your system to something lesser than that when you know that that could be the demands. I think your compatibility with what the rest of the system is capable of moving is a logical way of designing it. That's a capacity. That's not a take so to speak.

PORTALE & ASSOCIATES DEPOSITION REPORTERS

Page 57 - Page 60

BDAC MEETING Conde		nse	JULY 19, 1996
	Page 61		Page 63
1	CHAIRMAN MADIGAN: Alex.	1	would be the
2	MR. HILDEBRAND: I think the problem comes	2	MR. YAEGER: That's correct.
3	down to the fact that the description of alternative three	3	CHAIRMAN MADIGAN: TOM.
4	includes the statement that it preserves some continued	4	MR. GRAFF: I have a question for either
5	diversion from the common pool.	5	Judy or Dick.
6	Now, if you've got an isolated facility that's	6	On number six, conceptually is it consistent
7	quite capable of taking the entire flow, either all the	7	that an ecosystem restoration vision that says we are going
8	time or at some substantial portion of the time, then that	8	to restore whole habitats and then say we are going to
9	statement isn't valid and there is no operating plan	9	fine-tune the system with realtime monitoring for a
10	included in this that says how you're going to determine	10	specific species?
11	that you always have some water coming through the common	11	MR. DANIEL: The utility of realtime
12	pool.	12	monitoring is in reducing the conflict between diversions
13	If you had an operating plan for that and a	13	and productivity of fisheries. We've found over the last
14	means of assuring that it would be operated that way, it	14	two years that realtime monitoring can identify periods of
15	would be all right. But the plan is not complete if you	15	substantial concern, and when we have flexibility in the
16	don't say how you are going to preserve that guarantee.	16	system, which we are trying to design into the system, we
17	CHAIRMAN MADIGAN: These are exactly the	17	can literally shut off exports that we can't deal with in
18	kind of comments that we want to get to under the framing	18	any other fashion.
19	of advice to the CalFed people from this organization and	19	As far as the habitat work that we are
20	that's exactly the kind of comment we want to write down	20	proposing to do under the large scale ecosystem restoration
21	(indicating) so that it can be transmitted.	21	program, that will be fine-tuned, altered and improved
22	Thank you.	22	through what we are calling adaptive management, which will
23	Bob.	23	be an adjunct to realtime monitoring.
24	MR. RAAB: What Alex and Tom have just	24	As we learn, we will be able to modify.
25	been saying, it's starting to touch on an issue of	25	So that the realtime monitoring in this
	Page 62		Page 64
1	considerable gravity to many of us, and so far I've found	1	particular context is essentially are the fish out there in
2	the whole matter of the Peripheral Canal in the documents	2	front of your diversion, is there any way to deal with it
3	that have been published so far to be much too generalized.	3	other than shutting the pumps off, the answer being yes or
4	There are so many questions that are being	4	no, then you deal with the complications associated with
5	raised about the scale of these various proposals for the	5	that and that's something that's going on right now.
6	canal that I can't answer so I think that there is a need	6	There were several good examples of the value
7	to do more intensive documentation of just what these	7	of realtime monitoring over the last two years in that we
8	various proposals will do in the way of delivering water	8	were able to avoid very substantial losses of fishes
۱۵	around the Delta	٥	through realtime monitoring and cooperative management of

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

around the Delta. CHAIRMAN MADIGAN: Okay. Those are the kinds of comments we are going to be looking for. Roger. MR. STRELOW: Just a little clarification rather than a comment at this point. You mentioned a recommendation for a specific watershed management program and I just wondered how specifically defined that is or whether this is just a recommendation in concept at this point or are there some specifics in mind as to the type of program it would be, regulatory versus incentives versus subsidies --MR. YAEGER: At this point it is part of our Common Program and the way that it is structured is incentives for local agencies to pursue watershed

10

11

12

13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24

25

management plans.

through realtime monitoring and cooperative management of the Water Project diversions. 10

CHAIRMAN MADIGAN: Roberta and then Mary. MS. BORGONOVO: There were a couple questions that I would hope would be answered.

One would be the question of the fish screens again.

If the maximum efficiency for screens now is 2,000 CFS I just wondered why it wasn't at least considered in part of that range since you would not have this question of screens that have not been proven or relied upon?

MR. DANIEL: I don't want to leave you with the impression that the maximum efficiency of a fish screen has been identified.

24 MS. BORGONOVO: I understand. 25 MR. DANIEL: Most of the experience with

PORTALE & ASSOCIATES DEPOSITION REPORTERS

MR. STRELOW: Incentives for planning

Page 61 - Page 64

Page 65 fish screens have been for diversions up to about 3,000 workers that the legal requirements of CEQA/NEPA are fairly 2 cubic feet per second. 2 obvious and known. I think that what is going to be really 3 So we are moving into some new ground. There 3 essential along with that process as we all know, is that 4 are some engineering challenges and some answers that have 4 any discussion in further depth of any of these 5 to be dealt with before we could say for certain that a 5 alternatives has to also be paralleled with the development 5,000 CFS fish screen would be as efficient as it needs to 6 6 of some kind of institutional structure that's going to 7 be or a 10,000 or a 15,000. 7 assure that whatever combination of alternatives or 8 It's simply an area of research that has not 8 component actions that we see in September, '98 has the 9 9 been pursued to the extent that we need at this point. full support of all the stakeholders, such that we don't 10 MS. BORGONOVO: I guess it goes back to 10 talk about isolated facility without also discussing who 11 the question of the urban need. Is it for urban drinking 11 and what and who decides and where are decisions made about 12 water or is it for total urban need and just at least some 12 what water is going to move when and to whom. 13 discussion of that. 13 I think we all know that but I just wanted to 14 But my second question also goes to CFS. I 14 emphasize that now that I hope that that will be an ongoing 15 know that I can find this out if I go back through all of 15 central part of the discussion of this body, you know, in my many files, but CFS translated into acre feet per year 16 16 the next two years. 17 helps somebody like me and so what does that 5,000 CFS 17 CHAIRMAN MADIGAN: That's a yes. All 18 mean, what does 15,000 CFs mean? It would help to know 18 right. 19 what is the capacity now of the State Water Project in a 19 All right. Thank you very much. Good 20 year, what is the capacity of the Central Valley Project. 20 conversation. Let me ask at this point if there are any 21 So we can begin to compare some of these alternatives. 21 comments by members of the public concerning this 22 22 Are we talking about substitution? discussion. 23 Anyway, these are some of the issues I think 23 Dan. 24 24 that are important for the lay person to be able to get a DAN NELSON: Along the lines of Tom's line 25 25 grasp on. of thought on the sizing of the facility I think we also Page 66 Page 68 1 CHAIRMAN MADIGAN: Lester. that we came up with 15,000 as being the cap? 2 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SNOW: We certainly can 2 3 get a conversion table so everybody understands what the 3 Because it seems intuitively that if what units are and how they relate to each other. Lester was saying earlier, that there are times when there 4 5 But one real fundamental point that I need to are excess flows and we want to take advantage of those 5 6 make is that none of these alternatives change the capacity 6 excess flows and to put them in certain places we may not 7 of the two export systems. So you have capacity there 7 want to restrict ourselves at 15,000 CFS. So I guess I 8

today and none of these alternatives modify that.

And so a theoretical calculation of how much you could move out given the capacity in alternative three is absolutely identical to the theoretical you could move out in alternative one or the existing situation with no 12 13 activity.

So that does not change. It's the same for 15 every single alternative. We are not modifying the 16 capacity of the two projects.

We are modifying how you move water around the system but not the capacity of a project.

19 MS. BORGONOVO: That helps to know that, 20 to have it stated in there somewhere. 21

CHAIRMAN MADIGAN: Mary.

9

10

11

14

17

18

22

23

MS. SELKIRK: I just wanted to follow one of the comments that Alex and Bob and Tom have made.

24 That as we move into Phase II it's obvious that it's going to be essential and as we are seeing all the

ought to ask ourselves is 15,000 appropriate and how is it

would ask the same question that Tom is asking and where 8

9 did the 15,000 CFS come from?

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Are we locked into that or are we open to other options as we move forward?

CHAIRMAN MADIGAN: Okay. Thank you.

All right. Good discussion.

Let's move on to item number four, framing advice to CalFed process.

I want to start this out by wandering through a few things here.

Lester is going to lead this but it's really important at this point that all of us get our comments under the sort of the questions that Lester wants to focus on on record.

I'm going to ask Mr. Mantell and Mr. Patterson here in a minute to frame for us their hopes and aspirations for the comments that you are about to make. We are going to try to record those comments

PORTALE & ASSOCIATES DEPOSITION REPORTERS

Page 65 - Page 68

Page 69
1 not only on overheads here but to synthesize your remarks
2 so that we can come out with in most instances what I would
3 hope would be some kind of consensus comments "Yes, these
4 are questions that ought to be asked, yes, these are

5 thoughts that we have on the process" but also that there

6 would be individual comments even if that individual sort
7 of stands alone on the issue so that that message can be

8 delivered to the CalFed people as well.9 This is one of those where I wa

This is one of those where I want to take as much time as we need to go through the item because this is a real, real important session for all of us.

And for those of you in the audience your comments are important and appreciated as a part of this as well.

Roger, let me ask you to give us your thoughts on what you'd like to see come out of this.

17 MR. PATTERSON: Okay. I will try to do

18 that.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I agree with what Mike said, is that this is a very critical time in the process.

I think CalFed in establishing the BDAC recognize the value, certainly, the potential value and collective wisdom of the group that was put together, and it is -- it's really our hope that the recommendations and advice that come out of this be better than what we would

would

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

have gotten individually from you and your organizations.

That there is some synthesis of ideas and advice that comes

3 out of this process.

To the degree that it is possible to build consensus on issues that is our hope, that was our hope, and remains our hope that we can do that, but we recognize that there are a number of issues that that just may not be possible.

And where that occurs, I think CalFed is interested in knowing what those issues are and what the various views are and where those various views are held.

We want to know those issues that you may feel strongly about individually, just as well as we are interested in areas where there is very strong consensus in the group.

And I guess lastly I would say that we need to keep in mind the advice that we give to CalFed. It needs to be related to where we are in the process.

I think that's important that we acknowledge where we are in the process and we provide advice that is appropriate for that point.

We all know we have a long ways to go and this is certainly not the end of the road. It's just a very important point in the road for CalFed.

CHAIRMAN MADIGAN: Thank you, Roger.

Michael.

2 MR. MANTELL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I agree totally with what Roger said.

4 I think, you know, as this group knows setup 5 through the Federal Advisory Committee Act by the Secretary

Page 71

Page 72

6 Of Interior and by the Governor this is the key group

7 representative of all of the stakeholders that the agencies

8 making decisions are empowered to listen to and that's not

9 to say that the other public comments are a very important 10 part of this decision making but this is the group that was

intended to provide the key insights to the extent that

there could be consensus, the degree of consensus thatexists and so what comes out of this group will be very

closely paid attention to by the CalFed team.

Obviously, the agencies have their own statutory and trustee responsibilities that have to be fulfilled, but it's hard to conceive of decisions being made that don't reflect the consensus of this group.

I think that the issues that Lester has laid out in the memo in terms of how to think about framing this for CalFed are really right on target and among the most important is, and, again, picking up on Roger's comment, at this stage do we have the right alternatives, are they broad enough in scope to encompass all that needs to be

considered and yet focused enough so that we can really get

Page 70

to an end point and that's really the major context in which you are looking at this.

I think that with the signing of a major ballot measure for November SB 900 that will be the first measure on the ballot and I know we are going to talk about it later was a substantial amount of money there for the just laying the foundation for this program.

The same spirit of collaboration that went into putting that together, which is a really major achievement, hopefully can be reflected in this group as it looks at the alternatives and as it provides comments to CalFed and we move forward in the days and months ahead.

CHAIRMAN MADIGAN: Thank you, Michael.

Lester.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SNOW: Okay. I just wanted to review the five basic questions that we have framed and then go into each one individually.

We tried to think about the things that this group has discussed and has indicated is important and then also as Roger and Michael already described, what CalFed needs to hear.

The first is simply kind of the broad perspective, is the range, the three alternatives, with kind of the sub-options within them. Does that represent a reasonable range of alternatives to study in more detail

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Page 75

and see if they address the problems that we have 2 identified in this program?

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

15

16 17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

So that's a real basic threshold issue, are we basically on the right track, that's narrowed down from 20 to these three.

The second issue kind of has to do with another development in the program and that is the Common Program 7 and the idea of moving away from having alternatives that some have modest and moderate and extensive and moving to 9 this thought of having four common programs at basically the extensive level of implementation.

Is that a good thing to do?

13 Is that a right way to proceed with developing 14 alternatives?

And then kind of as an adjunct to that the issue of staging. Is it the way we have this set up and then each alternative talks about the staging where you step through implementation of these programs, rather than saying you do it all at once, that you work your way through these programs and you implement them in a staged fashion.

The fourth issue is actually something that we haven't talked about a whole lot but it's actually directly related to the charter for this group and that is just your opinion and advice about our public involvement, have we

I think as Michael indicated, basically I want 2 to try to get a sense overall if we are basically in the 3 right place on this if that's kind of the general feeling 4 of the group but also to record specific concerns that 5 people have so we are tracking both of those things.

6 MR. HASSELTINE: Mike and Sunne are both out of the room temporarily and Mike asked me to fill in. 8

So, Alex, go ahead.

MR. HILDEBRAND: After I received the packet for today I wrote a note to Lester. I would like to review the thrust of that with you because I feel that a lot of good work has been done and that we've made a lot of progress but that we are really not quite as far as we are trying to be here and that we better not rush it.

Let me just read some portions of my memo. Despite best efforts we don't really have three defined alternatives.

We have combined a broad array of possible components into two groups.

One is a group of sub-alternatives preserving the Delta -- is a group of sub-alternatives that provide physical assurance that the common interests in preserving the Delta will be maintained due to dependence on a common nool of water.

The other group involves major isolated

Page 74

gotten the right publics involved, have we outreached in a proper fashion. Are there better things that we need to do for Phase II?

And then the fifth question is very important. We've already had issues brought up this morning about what is it that needs to be addressed in Phase II? What kind of analysis? What are the issues that we need to make sure that we analyze?

There's already been considered discussion about an isolated facility and what needs to be considered about that and what we need to work on and so this kind of the question where we need to capture those kinds of issues to make sure we've got a list that we can present to CalFed and say, you know, here's what we have to do in Phase II.

If we don't cover these issues, we are going to start losing people that think we're not looking at the right problems and the right types of analysis.

So those are the five basic questions we want to work our way through, starting with the whole issue of do the three alternatives that we have developed represent kind of the breadth of alternative that need to be taken into the modeling and analysis phase into the programmatic level.

24 So with that we're ready to write and respond 25 to comments or concerns.

Page 76

facilities such that maintaining a common interest in 2 preserving the Delta will be dependent on operational 3 assurances that have not yet been devised and may not be enforceable. 4

As Michael said, I think that we are covering all of the options but we haven't focused it down to something we can really get our teeth into yet.

We have not made the choices within each of these groups that are intended to define and seek to optimize sub-alternatives which can then be studied and compared.

We have not even identified the assessments that must be made for each component, including each core component before it can at some appropriate level be firmly included in any alternative.

My experience has been that when we have even programmatic EIS's let alone the kind of thing we are talking about right now that if you don't spell out what further impacts have to be analyzed, assessments have to be made, they intend to get overlooked later on and you end up with a Fonzie and you go ahead and do it.

For example, there is as yet no recognition that converting agricultural land to flooded land in the Delta will evaporate significantly more water and thereby reduce water supply and that marshland evaporates even

more. This must be assessed.

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1 2 There is no explanation of why environmental 3 water is proposed to be acquired from three of the four 4 water -- San Joaquin tributaries rather than from users of 5 DMC water whose purchased water could then be released to 6 the river without reducing some summer river flow.

What is the potential under each sub-alternative for reducing the bromides and chlorides in exported water which derive largely from Bay water?

What is the evidence that the quote "Efficiency program will substantially reduce the dependence on the Delta for export" end of quote?

Why is there no mention of the pollution and drainage from the wetlands? This is a serious problem in the San Joaquin Valley.

Why is there no discussion of compliance with water right priorities under State water law?

I previously mentioned another examples.

There are also some policy questions on which no consensus has even been sought.

Should CalFed presume to decide that water should be reallocated from agriculture to urban environmental purposes. If so, what is the justification?

24 Why is reliability assumed to be essential for 25 municipal industry but not for agricultural in rural

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Page 79

JULY 19, 1996

The staff has done a great job in public 2 involvement but these Workshops are primarily brain 3 storming sessions. The ideas and perceptions they provide must then be subjected to more deliberate scrutiny 4 5 regarding feasibility impacts, interrelations, et cetera.

I believe that BDAC can contribute more and have a much better chance for later consensus if we first discuss basic policy questions and the pros and cons at an appropriate level of each component, that type of component. Let us not make choices before we have agreed on policies and before we have enough information for wise decisions and let us not pretend to have made choices we have not really made.

I conclude by indicating that my intent here is not to be disruptive and it is not a lack of confidence in the staff.

I don't know of anyone who could do this difficult job better than Lester so I'm not trying to throw rocks at anybody.

CHAIRMAN MADIGAN: Thank you, Alex. I wonder if you could put that in writing so that we can -- little joke.

23 Lester, would you want to respond? 24 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SNOW: Yeah. I mean, 25 Alex has submitted a very thoughtful letter and raised a

Page 78

communities.

When we talk of improving water supply to what uses do we plan to increase it and are we going to ignore the declining rate of Delta inflow and the decline of per capita water supply resulting from population growth?

What population are we planning for?

Are we going to ignore the long-term consequences of failure to provide a salt balance in the non-coastal areas that receive the salt load that is contained in Delta water and urban waste water?

Are we willing to degrade Delta water in order to facilitate treatment of water which is exported for urban use and then treated for potable quality before it is used for potable and non-potable purposes?

It is certainly appropriate to give the CalFed policy committee a progress report. The BDAC has I believe given tacit approval to the grouping of alternatives and the list of components to be considered. However, I don't believe we have yet the information needed to make choices even as to the firm inclusion of some classes of components in alternatives.

Furthermore, the staff appears to have made policy decisions regarding which it has not solicited input from the BDAC. It is regrettable that we are not further along but that is because the subject is so very complex.

Page 80

lot of issues.

Now, the way that we look at that and I think this is an important issue to discuss, is that many, if not in fact all of the issues that Alex raises, we feel is what Phase II is all about. The issue of what are the impacts of converting ag land to wetlands and how much additional evaporation do you get and what kind of drainage comes out of the wetlands in terms of total organic carbons.

In our opinion that's what Phase II is for. You set up the models to then start running these to start developing the data base with which to make decisions.

And so the track that we are on is let's get together the basic components that make sense that seem to fit together and then do the modeling and analysis that's necessary to come up with that kind of information.

What are the -- to use one of his examples, you know, creating a lot of wetlands sounds good for the ecosystem but what does it do for water quality and those are issues that we need to run to ground in Phase II.

So our general thought -- and this probably isn't an item by item to Alex's list -- but in general the issues that he raises go on our list of things that we need to make sure we develop the analysis for in Phase II.

So that's a very general response to those kinds of issues.

PORTALE & ASSOCIATES DEPOSITION REPORTERS

Page 77 - Page 80

Page 84

Page 81

1

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. HILDEBRAND: Lester, I agree that a lot of this has to be done in Phase II, but it concerns me 2 that in Phase 1 we haven't identified these assessments that need to be made so that we are sure that they are 5 going to be addressed.

1

3

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

7

8

9

10

11

I have no quarrel with putting off the assessment. It's outlining what assessments must be made it seems to me should be included in Phase 1.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SNOW: Okay. Well, maybe what we could do is those specific issues of concern we make sure that we list and then we have already set up kind of a standard way of dealing with NEPA and CEQA that 12 require you to look at a lot of those kinds of impacts that we kind of take as standard operating procedure.

But I think if BDAC wants to make sure that certain kinds of assessments are being made that's worth listing today and we can kind of try to generate a list of stuff that we already have underway in terms of developing the models, the economic impacts, water quality impacts, fisheries population, I mean, we are pouring over that kind of stuff now and I think it's worthwhile for BDAC to emphasize what it wants to see analyzed.

MR. HILDEBRAND: I guess part of my concern stems from having met and having had discussions with the programmatic EIS group and learning that they were and so when we talk -- you know, we heard that the ecosystem restoration Common Program was the most -- you know, the broadest program of its sort of

2 3

4 undertaken before and it includes hundreds -- you know,

5 many, many different things. Like it includes watershed

6 management. It includes creating wetlands. Well, with

7 watershed management are we simply, as someone said

8 earlier, providing incentive to do planning or are we going

9 to actually see some watershed management and improvement 10 take place as a result.

When we talk about water markets what really does that mean. When we talk about land retirement to improve water quality how will that -- what level of implementation are we talking about?

It seems to me that there is still just tremendous variability here and so I sort of do have a sense that we need to do a little more work in defining what these alternatives mean. Otherwise, I think you get the sense that we are all moving down a road and there is going to be this EIR/EIS process that like many other public processes that we've seen could sort of come to its own conclusions and take on a whole life of its own.

And so I do think that there needs to be continued discussion about what all of the many different actions that are contemplated do involve and that I don't

Page 82

not aware of some of the need for some of these assessments. So I think if the BDAC's going to be assured

3 that all of the necessary assessments are made we have to

4 have some indication, some listing of what these

5 assessments are going to be.

6 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SNOW: Okay.

CHAIRMAN MADIGAN: Thank you.

Roberta and then Judith.

environmental community like the way in which the whole ecosystem restoration is being undertaken, but we do have a

MS. BORGONOVO: Several of us in the

12 concern that the Delta component of the ecosystem

13 restoration and system integrity program is not adequate to

14 achieve the CalFed program mission, meaning that it still

15 needs more large scale components so Gary Bobker will speak

16 to that specifically and will be much more specific about

17 ways in which we think that whole program might be 18

addressed.

19 CHAIRMAN MADIGAN: Thank you. Judith.

20 MS. REDMOND: I think what may be relevant

21 to this discussion is just my sense that we do need to 22 further define what some of the alternatives mean, that I

23 don't necessarily think we've got a good understanding of

24 what they mean because there are literally hundreds of 25 different actions included in the whole set of alternatives have a solid enough sense of what they really mean and

2 what's really contemplated in some of these cases.

3 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SNOW: I think one of the issues that we are discussing is the difficulty that we

5 have had all along with the level of detail, where are we

on a spectrum of detail, and at times we are at a very 6

7 conceptual level and other times we want to be talking 8 about which acre of land for which type of habitat and

9 which specific watershed management technique, whether it's

managing grazing along stream side or whatever.

And I think it's important in terms of our three phased program to recognize that we are moving through that kind of process to be grouping concepts together to be adding detail to them getting to a point where we could start analyzing and then moving on to where you start getting project specific.

And I guess it's difficult to figure out, you know, what's the proper level to make a certain decision at?

But we are headed into a programmatic and so it's difficult to have, you know, detailed project impact kinds of information until you've seen what the cumulative impacts of a basic program would be.

So I'm not sure how to totally satisfy the issue that you raise without going and doing some of the

PORTALE & ASSOCIATES DEPOSITION REPORTERS

Page 81 - Page 84

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

25

1

2

3

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

9

10

11

12

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

Page 87

Page 88

Page 85

detailed work before we've done a programmatic analysis. 1 And so to some extent we are kind of joined 2 3 together in this together, you know, all the way through 4 the programmatic to be making these judgments, including 5 component refinement, as I mentioned earlier, with kind of 6 the three parallel paths that we are on and hopefully we 7 will develop that all in parallel. 8 And I don't know if that satisfies the issues

that you are raising but we are constantly going through a component refinement process at the same time we are trying to start doing the analysis that Alex has raised, for example, with respect to the impacts of the basic programs.

13 MS. REDMOND: Well, it just seems like 14 it's such an ambitious undertaking that having it -- at 15 this point having it taken over by a set of technicians who 16 are doing some kind of environmental analysis, I think it 17 would be very -- we need to be cautious about that, and 18 that the process of -- that you set up here with BDAC

really does need to continue at every step along the way. There is just so many, as I said before, different actions contemplated that putting them all together and figuring out what impact they are going to all have when you put them all together just seems very ambitious and maybe all, you know, we do just -- we can't move too quickly, I think.

just what we want" but I would like to get a sense of,

2 yeah, that's fair. Here are some concerns that we have

3 about it that reflect either a fairly diverse group that

4 are in here or even a single interest.

MR. MANTELL: Mike, if I could elaborate for a minute?

CHAIRMAN MADIGAN: Yeah, Michael.

MR. MANTELL: The CalFed management team is meeting over the course of the next couple weeks,

particularly with the meeting on July 29th that will also involve a public session.

At that meeting we want to be able to make some

decisions about how to move forward on the next phase of this program and we have asked Mike Madigan in his capacity as Chair to come to that meeting and represent -- present the thoughts of this group.

He probably will file a formal letter but also to discuss with us where he thinks this group is, either in terms of agreement or disagreement so that that can be a part of our decision-making process.

So that's what I would hope that this group is is orienting towards.

23 CHAIRMAN MADIGAN: Rosemary and then Tom. 24 MS. KAMEI: Yes. I guess the message that

I would like to send back to CalFed is that as we proceed

Page 86

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SNOW: Actually, the way you just framed that, it's a good way to put it. This afternoon we planned on discussing the

component refinement process, which clearly shows that both the work groups and the Bay Delta Advisory Council as well as Workshops are in the critical path for refining the detail of each of these components.

And so the way that you can think about it is we start the analytical process to generate the data that everybody has wanted.

At the same time we are on a path for providing the kind of detail you are suggesting and BDAC is in the critical path of that, as well as a Workshop in each of the major areas and so we intend to keep the collaborative process going rather than some NEPA nerd that's going off in a corner and coming up with a best solution or NEPA ninjas, whichever you prefer.

CHAIRMAN MADIGAN: Tom.

19 MR. GRAFF: I am a little puzzled about 20 what we are doing here. Do you want a motion that says 21 yes? 22

CHAIRMAN MADIGAN: No. No.

23 What I want is a series of comments that are a 24 fairly accurate reflection of the thought of the group. I don't expect any of us to say, "Yeah, sure enough, this is 25

forward this is really sort of the bones.

We haven't really had a lot of detail and as we move forward I think that it will crystallize in the programmatic stage but it is just a range and keep in mind that it is still very broad and because we are moving forward doesn't mean that as we get more refinement that we are not going to like what we are going to see.

And so just to reiterate the fact that we may not be all sort of moving forward with the next step that we do see.

CHAIRMAN MADIGAN: Thank you. Tom. MR. MADDOCK: I believe that the range of alternatives here is pretty close and I tend to agree with Dan Nelson's comment that I wouldn't be sure that the upper limit here on the dual facility is really what is suggested for the reasons that he's stated.

I suppose I'm willing to accept the fact that these issues that Alex brings up, maybe we ought to have a checklist of these issues, and I can see as we go through this that as we analyze them one important issue is going to come up and that's going to be how much is this thing going to cost and what are we going to get for it but I'm willing to accept that process and go through it, and I think the hardest thing at this point in looking at the alternatives is really what is the definition and the

PORTALE & ASSOCIATES DEPOSITION REPORTERS

Page 85 - Page 88

Page 89 1 measure of achievement of ecosystem restoration? what the status is of the land retirement question. But 2 I mean, I can understand if we need to build a 2 then I'd like to flush what other questions you have that 3 reservoir, okay, how big is it and what will it yield? 3 do lead you in that direction so that we can answer them so 4 Or if you are going to build some channels. 4 that we can go on. 5 But I suppose the hardest area, perhaps for all 5 Don, I'll get to you --6 of us, is what do we mean and how do we quantify Delta or 6 MR. BRANSFORD: If I could just add one 7 ecosystem restoration? 7 other thing to your comment so that when Lester 8 I'm willing to accept this range of 8 comments -- earlier I heard when we were talking about land 9 alternatives but with the caveat of do we have the right 9 retirement or ag land retirement on the alternative was 10 upper limit here on the number three? 10 conservation easements and I would like you to address that 11 11 CHAIRMAN MADIGAN: Thank you. issue, too, because in our area we look at conservation 12 David. easements the same way that some people look at land 12 13 MR. GUY: I think we are all in this 13 retirement as a decrease in productive ag land and so I'd incredible quest for certainty and for detail and where 14 14 like to you address that issue, also, in the context obviously it's not there at this process and there is, of 15 15 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SNOW: Actually, I course, I think that we can all look at and find things 16 16 don't recall the way conservation easements was discussed. 17 that we don't like with some of the details in here, that 17 Was that in the ecosystem program? 18 are in here, but it seems to me the more important question 18 MR. BRANSFORD: Uh-huh (yes). 19 at this time is that each group or individual or 19 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SNOW: Because there is 20 organization, whatever it might be, needs to I think look 20 another concept that's come out of the San Joaquin Valley 21 at this in the big picture and say, you know, are we moving 21 on not conservation easements --22 22 forward, because that is in fact the intent of the process MR. BRANSFORD: I was thinking in the 23 23 is for everybody to be moving forward and feel that they north. 24 24 are going to get something out of it and I think that But in the Sacramento Valley we have plenty of 25 that's what's really important. 25 habitat, we believe habitat, and so we don't look favorably Page 90 And I'll just use an example, one that I'm upon additional conservation type easements and I'm a 1 1 2 going to keep bringing up. 2 3 If you send a message to the agricultural 3 4 community that you are going to start retiring significant 4 5 amounts of land, that sends a real strong message that we 5 describe it. 6 are not moving forward for agriculture. We are, in fact, 6 7 7

Page 92

moving backwards. And so that's why it seems to me that the process needs to go into the more detailed Phase II and I think we're -- you know, that has to happen. Otherwise we can sit here and argue for the next two years on Phase 1 if we don't, but at the same time I think there are a couple of very important decisions that need to be made right now

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

moving forward, and I think -- I hope the comments from the 15 different people have reflected that. CHAIRMAN MADIGAN: Actually, that's a good question, and I want to spend a minute on that with Lester.

to go into Phase II to assure that every group is, in fact,

18 19 I have heard from more than one that there is a 20 concern that we are in the mode of large scale land 21 retirement and that, therefore, this program is at its 22 heart anti ag and I want to deal with that today because I 23 don't want to go forward into Phase II with any lingering notions or doubts around here that that's the intent of 24 this process and so maybe for starters we ought to discuss little unclear as to where you're going with that. EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SNOW: Okay. Rick, I think you brought up the other concept. Why don't you

MR. SOEHRN: If I said conservation easement, I misspoke. The concept that I was thinking about was a conservation reserve program, where you might include a variety of techniques, including locational temporary fallowing, perhaps voluntarily moving to crops that use less water in order to reduce demand in a district, not a conservation easement.

CHAIRMAN MADIGAN: Okay.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SNOW: On the general issue of the role of land retirement, there is a couple of ways for me to start dealing with that.

One I think is a result of our scoping and general discussion with people.

We have concluded that there can be a role, there is a role for land retirement in the water quality component and it's one among many tools that can be utilized to deal with drainage issues. It's not the exclusive tool.

With respect to particularly the program of water use efficiency, the argument has been made and I

PORTALE & ASSOCIATES DEPOSITION REPORTERS

Page 89 - Page 92

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Page 93 think it's a compelling argument that simply doing away 2 with the use is not a water use efficiency. It's something 3 other than that.

And so I think -- maybe to back up a step, I think this issue of where we are with land retirement has been evolving pretty steadily over the last 60 to 90 days.

4

5

6

14

15

25

1 2

3

4

5

6

17

18

19

20

7 Certainly, a conclusion that there is not a 8 role for large scale permanent fallowing in the CalFed 9 Program and I think the program has been evolving that if 10 there is consideration of permanent fallowing as a 11 mechanism it is part of a local deliberation in the form of 12 an integrated resources plan or something along those 13 lines.

The issue of temporary or rotational fallowing is quite different and can be part of the drought program.

16 And that's probably not real definitive but I guess what I'm suggesting is that the policies and 17 18 definitions we've developed around the water use efficiency 19 program, permanent land retirement as a key component of 20 this program does not fit in. It can be a consideration of 21 the local agencies. Rotational fallowing or temporary 22 fallowing can fit into the definition but permanent 23 fallowing does not and I don't know if that's enough of a 24 clarification on that. This is something that we are still

people who otherwise take water from the Delta Mendota Canal and release that water instead to the river and then 3 you don't affect the summer flow.

But although this point has been raised a number of times it continues to be totally ignored.

There is no indication of any reassessment of what it does to agriculture to acquire this water in the tributaries. So there is still other things in here. I won't go through the whole litany, but agriculture is just bashed up and down.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SNOW: Let me address that last issue most specifically.

If it is determined that paying a farmer what he asks for his water supply is anti-agrigulture, then we have that in this plan.

If it's the wishes of BDAC to say to the agricultural community "You may not sell your water", then and that's interpreted as friendly to ag, then we are not on the right track in terms of our draft.

Our draft clearly would indicate that a willing seller, a willing buyer can enter into arrangements and the Westlands Water District can enter into agreement with the Friant Water District and a water transaction can take place.

And so that's a real fundamental issue this

Page 94

I think that's the trend that we have seen in that program and those definitions.

discussing through the water use efficiency work group but

CHAIRMAN MADIGAN: Alex.

MR. HILDEBRAND: There are a couple things here that as land -- permanent land retirement isn't the only way this program is bashing agriculture.

7 As Lester says, there is this prevalent 8 attitude that it's okay to shut down agriculture during the 9 drought but it isn't okay to set down other things and the 10 agricultural industry can't recover from prolonged 11 shutdowns whether they are rotational or not. Either your 12 suppliers go out of business or your employees leave the 13 country because they have no way to make a living. It's 14 just a fallacious notion that there is no problem for 15 agriculture to shut down in order to make water reliable for other people. 16

And then there is this business that in these alternatives it still, I believe, talks about acquiring a 1,000 acre feet or something of that magnitude from the water short tributaries in the San Joaquin.

You don't create any water that way.

21 22 What you do is you shift water from agriculture 23 to something else, and consequently you take water away 24 from agriculture in the summer and if you want to acquire water for San Joaquin River flow, why not buy it from

group needs to deal with. If a free market transaction is anti somebody, then we clearly have that in our program.

In terms of the issue of because of the drought agriculture needing -- an agricultural district needed to consider temporary fallowing, we also expect that to be happening in the urban areas. We expect drought ordinances. We expect cutbacks in outdoor irrigation. We expect golf courses to let their roughs go brown.

Most of the major cities have ordinances to that effect so it's not being isolated to the agricultural community. That's being focused on all water users. You've got a drought and you need to take extraordinary measures during the drought to respond to that.

But I think the fundamental issue that Alex has brought up is if we are interpreting free market transaction as being anti-agriculture then we do have that in our program.

CHAIRMAN MADIGAN: Is that a commonly shared feeling around here?

MR. BRANSFORD: Which?

CHAIRMAN MADIGAN: That those sorts of free market transactions are in fact being viewed as anti-ag?

MR. HILDEBRAND: The discussion is always ag giving up the water, not somebody else. I never hear

PORTALE & ASSOCIATES DEPOSITION REPORTERS

Page 93 - Page 96

Page 96

Page 97

anybody, until just now, say we might shut down the golf courses even. This business of the --

CHAIRMAN MADIGAN: It's been on the books
for a while. Alex

4 for a while, Alex. 5 MR. HILDEBRAND: -- of the third party 6 impacts a willing seller is a serious issue. At our last 7 meeting we distributed the proposed model transfer act and 8 part of that is to say that the sellers will decide whether 9 there is a third party impact and if you sell water on the 10 San Joaquin tributaries, for example, to agriculture water 11 and let it down for fish instead of in the spring when we 12 don't need it, instead of letting it come down in the 13 summer, a lot of us don't have any flow in the summer 14 except the return flow from ag. There are enormous third 15 party impacts. It also affects the temperature in the

stream. It affects the direct ecological effects as well
as agricultural effects.
So all along you look at these things and you
find they are all tilted to the adverse to agriculture.
This program as it's now set up is very adverse to

agriculture. Whether it's beneficial for somebody else ornot it's adverse to agriculture.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

16

17

23 CHAIRMAN MADIGAN: Tom.
24 MR. GRAFF: I guess everyone is entitled
25 to his opinion.

Page 98

The general comment I was going to make earlier kind of echoed a couple of comments that I heard around the table.

One was Michael Mantell's, saying that he wanted to see this program continue along the lines of the consensus efforts that just led to SB 900.

In light of Alex's comments I'm sort of

wondering where he is coming from. I was going to make a little speech praising State Senator Costa and Secretary of State Jones as the main sponsors of SB 900 which EDF and other environmental organizations also helped out on, but a major component in SB 900, as I'm sure we'll hear later in

13 the day in more detail, is essentially a blanket

endorsement of this process, of the Bay Delta program and this process.

Last I heard State Senator Costa and Secretary of State Jones were not eco freaks in their general orientation.

orientation.
 CHAIRMAN MADIGAN: Or necessarily anti-ag.
 MR. GRAFF: Or even anti-ag. I also,

however, thought that Judith's comment was salient and it kind of bears here.

You know, each of these particular issues, including, you know, free market in water which EDF generally supports has complications. There are third party impacts, impacts on communities, impacts on the

2 environment, and I have a lot of confidence at this point,

3 anyway, in Lester and his staff to look into those and as

4 we go gown the road in -- on particular programs and

5 approaches and, oh, if that means we've got to look at

6 impacts on the South Delta, we can look at those.

7 MR. HILDEBRAND: I am not opposed to 8 SB 900.

9 CHAIRMAN MADIGAN: Dan Nelson had his hand

10 up.

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Dan first.

DAN NELSON: Yes, first of all, I think -- I thank you for the opportunity to be able to air some of this out because I do think the timing is appropriate. We are at a pivotal stage in CalFed and the discussion is appropriate because agriculture is sensing a disconnect from CalFed and is becoming leery with the direction that CalFed is headed and I think it's worthwhile to take note of that and to address it one way or another.

Some of the indications -- or some of the things that agriculture looks at at CalFed sort of scratching its head is it's our understanding that what it is we collectively are all doing here are working on the ecosystem, parallel with that we are working on improving water quality and parallel with that we are working on

Page 100

increasing the supply for California for the future.

Those three things it's our understanding have to move along together.

Well, frankly, agriculture is looking at the CalFed process and sees a tremendous amount of emphasis on ecosystem restoration, as Dick Daniel mentioned earlier, this is probably the most innovative and progressive program the United States has ever seen. We've seen a lot of emphasis on water quality but we've seen sort of a finessing of the water supply elements of what it is we are trying to do in CalFed and it's almost sort of a trust me, we are going to be okay at the end of all of this approach to agriculture on their water supply concern.

And what enhances that is not only are we reluctant to talk about increasing the water supply, at the same time we are talking about land retirement. And so I mean, it shouldn't come to any surprise to folks that agriculture is getting a little leery of where it is that CalFed is headed on those two specific issues.

Last but not least and again I might be getting on some real thin ice here but agriculture, frankly, looks at a lack of sensitivity, maybe a lack of expertise within CalFed staff on agricultural issues. They've got a tremendous staff for ecosystem restoration. They've got some great background for urban quality but, frankly, we

PORTALE & ASSOCIATES DEPOSITION REPORTERS

Page 97 - Page 100

are not seeing the agricultural type people or the water relationship between the urban water conservation Council supply type people within that staff as possibly a reality and CalFed with regard to defining a common language around 2 check and that is looked at as problematic amongst 3 reliability, and this in some respects I think follows out 4 agriculturalists. 4 a lot of Alex's comments because there has been less -- I 5 These are all the things that, again, we 5 think less of a really detailed look at both the capacity for establishing reliability through water conservation, 6 appreciate the opportunity of bringing this up and airing 6 7 this out. These are pivotal issues and they do need to be 7 and this has to do with some of the comments that Roberta 8 addressed. 8 made earlier, that reliability can also -- it's a matter of 9 CHAIRMAN MADIGAN: I don't want anybody to policy and philosophy that we look at kinds of 10 leave this room today with the notion that this program is 10 reliabilities that can be established through water that's 11 anti-ag so I want to take the time that's necessary to air 11 saved, and I think that behooves us to look beyond the 20 12 those kinds of concerns and I thank you for that. 12 year timeline. What I found as I looked at these 13 13 alternatives was that timeline began to grow and grow and 14 MR. BELZA: I wanted to go back and 14 grow. 15 address the water transfer issue. That we don't view 15 When I started thinking actually about what that -- the constituents I represent don't view that as 16 16 kinds of decades are we talking about in terms of staged anti-ag done properly with assurances. The one thing we 17 17 implementation, certainly with regard to Delta restoration, 18 see and always have thought of as anti-ag was user 18 we are talking decades. 19 initiated water transfers. Done properly we feel that they 19 And I think that's good. I think that is the 20 can be a component and work successfully as they have in 20 paradigm from which we should be operating. 21 21 the past. So I think that there is a job to be done in 22 22 CHAIRMAN MADIGAN: Mary. the water use efficiency sub-group work group, 23 MS. SELKIRK: I have a comment with regard 23 specifically, with regard to how urban best management 24 to water efficiencies so --24 practices are going to be implemented across the state. 25 25 CHAIRMAN MADIGAN: Time out. There is a lot of discussion in that group with Page 102 MS. SELKIRK: All I wanted to say is that regard to what that's going to look like. 1 1 2

Page 104

2 I can reserve my comments. They're not specifically with 3 regard to ag so I'll pass on to or defer to somebody who 4 wants to speak on that issue. What I have to say I think 5 relates, but it's not directly related to this. 6 CHAIRMAN MADIGAN: Yes, sir, I will get to 7 you. We will have a public comment period on this. 8 A SPECTATOR: Do you want me to make a 9 brief comment about this thing between agriculture and 10 BDAC? 11 CHAIRMAN MADIGAN: No, I don't. 12 A SPECTATOR: Okay. 13 CHAIRMAN MADIGAN: I do but I don't while 14 I've got the members of the BDAC who are still commenting. 15 I will call at the end of this for public 16 comment, though. 17 Mary, was that it then? 18 MS. SELKIRK: Let me go ahead and say what 19 I was going to say. 20 CHAIRMAN MADIGAN: Sure, go ahead. 21 MS. SELKIRK: I think one of the things

22

23

24

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I think that the CalFed staff has both a need to respond to but also provide some leadership on the urban side with regard to all of the kinds of practices that you were mentioning, Lester, that are at this point variously assumed, you know, drought practices, drought supply, delivery, all of that. There is a huge variation across the state, some of which is inevitable.

But I think that in order to -- I think to provide -- to create greater credibility in this process there has to be a very, very careful look over the next couple of years in how we are going to define efficiencies in water use in California.

I understand that we are not here to solve the problems of the State but we are dealing with the ultimate bottleneck for the State.

CHAIRMAN MADIGAN: Thank you. Judith and Bob Raab and then Steve Hall. MS. REDMOND: Yeah, I think part of -- it kind of goes back to the original comment so I'll be really brief.

When David was speaking he said, you know, that what we are all looking for is a high level of detail and I think that's not actually what I'm pointing out in term of increasing the level of confidence. I think in order to

PORTALE & ASSOCIATES DEPOSITION REPORTERS

that I would like to ensure that CalFed and BDAC together

pursue in this next phase is to more clearly define the

relationship on the urban side with regard to this whole

issue of water use efficiency, that there is a well defined

Page 101 - Page 104

18

19

20 21

22

23

24

25

the Bay Area.

Page 105 increase the level of confidence it's more that we have to 2 be careful about the language that when we say watershed 3 management, I'm just using that as an example because it 4 came up earlier, making sure that everyone here understands 5 what's meant by watershed management same as when we say 6 land use retirement, what really is intended and there are 7 so many different components to all of the alternatives that I have the sense that some of them might just get 8 9 lost. Some of them might be, you know, implemented to a 10 very high degree and others not at all because we haven't 11 really talked about them and understood them as we go along. 12 13 So I tend to see us as an advisory group that 14 maybe doesn't get too involved in a really deep level of 15 detail and more that in order to give us some confidence 16 about the direction here, that we have to ensure that there 17 is a level of understanding regarding the specific actions 18 and what they really mean and what the range of 19 implementation scenarios are. 20 And I just don't feel like we have that 21 understanding yet but that as we move along we just have to 22 keep talking about that. 23 CHAIRMAN MADIGAN: Thank you. 24 Bob. 25 MR. RAAB: I have some feedback and some 25 Page 106 impressions based on this feedback from several Workshops 1 2 that I've been involved in with several of the Bay Area 3 conservation organizations. 4 First, I want to make it quite clear that there 5 is no criticism of Lester and CalFed --6 CHAIRMAN MADIGAN: You know, it's okay to 7 criticize Lester and CalFed. You guys all treat him so 8 nicely. 8 9 9 10 (Off-the-record discussion) 10 11 11 12 12 MR. RAAB: There is very little awareness 13 of the CalFed Program. There is very little comprehension 13 14 of the alternatives and parenthetically I think that's 14 15 inevitable because I think we just at the start of going 15 16 into Phase II, as far as comprehension in general public in 16

Page 107 is the process to the three alternatives? How much 2 flexibility is there going to be in Phase II? How much 3 public input or will public input have any real meaning in 4 Phase II? 5 And just a couple of comments of my own. 6 I think SB 900 is a real opportunity to greatly 7 increase a public awareness of the CalFed Program and what 8 we are trying to do. 9 And no doubt you've already thought of this, 10 Lester, but it sure is a good opportunity to tie in the 11 program with what's going to be said in the media about 12 SB 900. 13 Just to reiterate, Phase II is I going to be, I 14 think, the ballgame, as far as I can tell, whether we get 15 support or not in the Bay Area. 16 It's a small sampling, anyway, but I think it's 17 going to be crucial. 18 CHAIRMAN MADIGAN: Thank you. I 19 appreciate your comments. 20 Steve. 21 MR. HALL: I used to represent agriculture 22 so although I represent both urban and agricultural water 23 interests I think I still have some sense of where 24 agriculture might be on this, and speaking for myself, I'm already convinced that neither this program nor the

Page 108

alternatives are anti-ag, but I don't think that we can 2 today having said that even if we all agree give agriculture or for that matter any interest group all of 3 4 the assurances that it will need. 5 I go back to Dan Nelson's statements about the way the program as perceived as creating agriculture's 6 7

interests, but I also heard Mary Selkirk say that she and others need to be assured that the program is going to deal legitimately with water conservation, both in the urban and agricultural sectors. I heard Bob Raab speaking for the Bay Area community, saying they need some assurances.

Certainly, the folks that Ted and Don and others represent need those same kinds of assurances. That's really what this is all about.

I mean, the assurance work group is based on an idea that has been around for several years now and that is that we not only need to address the technical biological issues and the plumbing issues in the Delta, at the heart of this is reaching a political agreement that provides a level of assurance to all of the stakeholders and we all understand that.

So I think that's really what I'm hearing at this point, and I'm wondering, Hap Dunning is certainly a very capable person to Chair that work group and I think we ought to let that group do their work, but I guess I would

One question that does come up is how locked in PORTALE & ASSOCIATES DEPOSITION REPORTERS

What these people are thinking about is still

more exported water from the Delta for Northern California.

What are the effects of these alternatives on

And parenthetically nothing is being said in a

the Peripheral Canal and flows and is there going to be

the Bay? What about the water quality in the Bay?

negative way about farmers and farming.

Page 105 - Page 108

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Page 109 ask you, Mike, and you, Sunne, and you, Lester, whether you think the breadth of their examination is sufficient given 3 the fact that we are not just talking about assurances for 4 the Delta ecosystem. 5 We are talking about assuring all of the 6 stakeholders that they are going to have their needs met at 7 some reasonable level, not to get everything they want, but 8 to have their needs reasonably met. 9 It would be unfair probably to ask that particular group of people to try to address of issue but 10 11 it seems to me that during Phase II we really need to 12 attack those interests and be able to provide people with 13 some level of assurances, if not through that group then in 14 some way through the program and I'm curious as to how you 15 think we can do that. 16 CHAIRMAN MADIGAN: That's a good question. 17 I think Sunne and Lester and I need to talk 18 about it. 19 MR. HALL: That's fine. 20 CHAIRMAN MADIGAN: I don't want to give 21 you an off the top because I think that's an important 22 question. 23 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SNOW: Mike, if I would 24 maybe just add --25 CHAIRMAN TENNIS: Lester, however, wants

Joaquin farmers in agriculture supports voluntary transfers as long as there are proper third party protections.

3 I agree with what Dan and Steve had to say, but 4 I think that -- I don't think there is any anti-ag in the 5 process here, but I think it will occur when you analyze 6 what the cost will be to give the necessary supplies for 7 water deficient areas, that we are in a high cost water 8

I think the anti-ag impact will be when ag can't afford it and parts of it fall to the wayside because of the cost. And I think that's something we are facing in Kern County and we have to look at and possibly there is, you know, there's ways to deal with that but I don't see any one way that we can have the facilities do everything we want to solve all of the problems in Delta and ag pay a share and everybody withstand that cost. I don't think it will work.

CHAIRMAN MADIGAN: Thank you.

Roberta.

MS. BORGONOVO: This was a comment I was going to reserve for later when we were talking about public input, but one of the concerns that I have that is the way in which we move through the phases and we are looking at assurances and then we make modifications at those different alternatives.

to give you something.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

15

16

17

18

19

20

**EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SNOW: Information as** opposed to an answer.

This is not criticism in the way that the Chair has been conducting this meeting, however (laughter).

There's two parts to that, Steve, in terms of the assurances in terms of what people get.

One is the generic assurances, what does it take to provide an assurance that an ecosystem program that spreads over 30 years will be done after 15 years and will keep doing it, but the other is a real specific one that's

11 12 dependent on the Phase II analysis and that is how do these

13 alternatives perform in terms of which one can give you

14 more critical year flows for fisheries?

Which alternative produces how much potential increased water supply and under what conditions, and so as that information is developed I think it can be coupled with efforts of looking at the assurances to see how this particular structure of assurances can ensure these kinds of yields or these kinds of instream flows or what have you.

21 22 And so I think there is kind of a merging of 23 those two issues somewhere in the middle of Phase II.

24 CHAIRMAN MADIGAN: Howard. 25 MR. FRICK: I think in the South San Page 110

2

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

One of the examples that came up yesterday in the financing Workshop is how do you take into account the market incentives? How do you take into account the local input as people begin to understand how they fit into the whole process?

Does that change the size of your storage, your needs, and so that's just a question that I would like to have that assurances group take a look at. That whole question of modification. I think that several of the user groups and this BDAC have talked about a cascading effect, a way of pursuing one alternative and if it doesn't work, you go to the second alternative but the whole question of momentum comes up. Will there be so much invested in the planning that we are really not able to make that shift?

And I think that that's what you're trying to get at with adaptive management but that's not clear to me exactly how that would work and so I have to agree with Steve. I think the assurances group is key but they have this huge task in front of them.

CHAIRMAN MADIGAN: Stu.

MR. PYLE: I appreciate the comments that Dan Nelson had, you know, indicating that there are a lot of concerns about the process, but I think we have to kind of look at where we are in the process and go back to what started this, recognizing that not only agriculture but

PORTALE & ASSOCIATES DEPOSITION REPORTERS

Page 109 - Page 112

Page 112

Page 113

- urban water use was way down on the scale because of the
- 2 operations of the Endangered Species Act impact on Delta
- exports prior to the December 15th, '94 Accord, which you
- 4 were responsible in bringing about, Dan; and right now we
- 5 are supporting this process here to try to see what can be
- 6 done to, as we say, fix the Delta and determine what type
- 7 of a water supply can be operated to take the place of what
- 8 we had prior to the Accord, and we are in the three year
- window where we are working through to try to get to this
- 10 answer of will we be better off or will we not be as well
- 11 off as we were and we are not going to know that until we
- 12 begin to get some of the numbers and the metrics and so on 13 and so forth on this program, which is going to include
- 14 both water supplies and costs and so forth. So we've got a
- 15 long way to go.

16 I think it's fine to raise this program. I 17 think the recognition has come on the land retirement,

18 which is kind of the red flag for agriculture.

I think that message is well across right now

20 but then there is still the issue of water transfers and I

21 think that is, as Howard is saying, there is a lot of

22 recognition of the need for water transfers. Farmers are 23 participating in that. So I think these things are going

24 to work out.

19

25

5

6

8

16

And I think that we really need to do is keep

Page 114

moving the process ahead without -- and look at some of 1 these numbers, assurances, issues and so forth before we 2

3 start trying to chip away at it too much.

CHAIRMAN MADIGAN: All right. This is an appropriate time for public comment. I hope that those of you who wish to make comment on this particular item have

7 filled out a card so we have your names and addresses.

Sir, I know that you wish to be heard. Go

9 ahead. Use the microphone up here.

10 RICHARD HARTER: I appreciate coming here.

11 I'm impressed with what's going on here, and I see -- I'm 12 from Butte County. I am a retired farmer, and I haven't

13 seen so -- I'm probably an environmentalist, maybe I'm an

14 environmental freak or something, but I've been a farmer

15 all of my life and I have gotten away from using chemicals.

And, briefly, this thing about what's going on with the environment and the endangered species, I gave a

17 18 little spiel July 19th. You had a Workshop and I addressed

the fact that I got a collection of Indian rocks in my yard 19

20 which I picked up during the course of my life as a farmer

21 and I addressed the fact that contemplating these Indian

22 rocks was like going to church, that these Indians look at

23 things entirely different than we did. They worshiped the

creator, the earth was sacred. The communities of flora 24

and fauna were -- those were holy, and they lived with the

5

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

6

7

11

12

13

14

22

23

24

25

creator, the great spirit. I think their great spirit, I

2 think our God is the same.

3 I picked up this poster the other day

4 (indicating).

This is put out by nothing less than the United States Department of Agriculture.

7 The heading is "Harmony, A partnership With A 8 Healthy Land" (indicating).

"American Indians have always understood nature's delicate balance that keeps the heartbeat of the earth strong.

"Show your thanks for nature's bounty by giving back to the earth. Call 1-800-A-SOIL for your free action packet."

So this, the sponsors of the people involved with this, are the United States Department of Agriculture. National Resources Conservation Service, National Association of Conservation Districts, National Association of State Conservation Agencies.

So, anyway, not to drag this on and on, but I think that when you get right down to it, the United States Department of Agriculture and I think farmers, too, I think the way farmers relate to the land is something that is changing, and I know up in Butte County the Western Canal

24 25 and the M & T reaction and so many of the farm oriented

Page 116

people are involving themselves in things to help the fish,

moving the pumps and screening the diversions, and it's 3 just a tremendous effort.

4 And so, anyway, I admire what you folks are 5 doing and carry on.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN MADIGAN: Thank you, sir.

8 I didn't get your name.

9 RICHARD HARTER: Richard Harter. I'm a 10 retired farmer.

CHAIRMAN MADIGAN: Thank you, sir. Thank you very much.

Mr. Petry.

MR. PETRY: Yeah, Ed Petry, 93640 Mendota.

15 What we have to do here or what you people have 16 to do is two things. One of them is to put a smile on 17 Roger Patterson's face and the other one is to put one on 18 Alex Hildebrand's face.

19 After you accomplish that then we can all go 20 home, and, as you can see, it's not going to be an easy 21 thing to do.

been people here representing agriculture and Alex

I've been coming to these Bay-Delta meetings. I came to them when it was BDOC. They wrote their by-laws, I went through all that and I sat through it, but there has

PORTALE & ASSOCIATES DEPOSITION REPORTERS

Page 113 - Page 116

Hildebrand has poured his heart and soul into it and I 1 2 think he's done a good job. 3

His letter of June 21st, in my opinion, was 4 short, and I hope you all read it.

There was a lot of meaningful thoughts behind it and the man knows what he's talking about.

And there are other members here at BDAC that do recognize that agriculture is going to get hurt unless we do something about it, and the one thing that will resolve all of the problems is money, money, money. And that's what this is going to take to get additional storage. That's what it's going to take to clean up the San Luis drain and the contaminants. That's what it's going to take to bring back better water quality.

And this is what we've all got to be concerned about, and I think the Bay Delta staff is doing a fine job and the Council members, also.

And I know because I've been at all of your meetings except two and I want to thank you for your input and what you've done and the thought that you have been giving to rural communities and agriculture water quality and other things of that nature that's going to resolve these problems.

24 Thank you.

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

25

1

2

CHAIRMAN MADIGAN: Thank you, Mr. Petry.

1 program.

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2 I think that's true but there has not been any 3 agreement as to what that single comprehensive program is. 4 How much is it going to cost? What really are we trying to 5 accomplish, and how are we going to stage it out and we need those objectives to be able to have that discussion, 6 7 to prioritize that discussion and then go forward with 8 defining some of the actions.

The second comment I have has to do with the alternatives themselves and again focusing on the ecosystem aspect.

That right now includes the CVPIA actions. Much of the discussion we have are related to CVPIA activities. What I would suggest we need to do so that we don't get -- so we make life easier for all of us is we need to separate out CVPIA from the alternatives and we need to have that as part of the no action plan, and there's four reasons that I say that that will fit there. One is it clearly is independent of what happens in a BDAC solution CVPIA was mandated, has very specific objectives, has even some very specific actions. Those will happen regardless of what happens in this forum and they are happening right now.

Second, to make the decision that this group working with CalFed needs to make and that decision is to

Page 118

Yes, sir?

JEFF PHIPPS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

3 My name is Jeff Phipps working with the

Northern California Power Agency. 4

5 I have some responses to the first question 6 that I wanted to provide.

7 Much of what a lot of the BDAC members have 8 been talking about is wanting some more detail.

9 What I might suggest is the concern and the 10 frustration that we are having at this point in the process right now is a lack of specific measurable, quantifiable 11

12 objectives that we have consensus on.

13 We keep stepping to the trying to get to 14 actions and specific activities, but what we don't agree on 15 is what we are really trying to accomplish specifically. 16 Water quality, what level are we really trying to achieve, 17 when and where? Water supply, when, what, how much, when,

where, how?

18 19 I think those are the discussions we need to 20 have before we get into the details and a lot of the 21 detailed number crunching. Certainly, when we come to the 22 common programs one of the issues there is Lester and his 23 staff has made comment that we are in agreement that we 24 want -- and I'll pick on ecosystem because I work with the CVPIA a lot, that we all want a single comprehensive

Page 120

decide based on the objectives, the cost and the benefits what actions you want to take. You need to separate out CVPIA from that on the ecosystem side so you can see what extra benefit you are getting for what cost compared to what you're trying to achieve.

The third reason is if you look at the principles that Lester has so very well-developed CVPIA is contrary to one of those principles, and that is the one that not to redirect cost to other parties.

CVPIA clearly was a redirection of costs from water and power users to the environmental. It was a mitigation. So it's clearly in conflict with that principle so if you leave it in the alternatives, then you have created a problem.

And, lastly, the issue hasn't been discussed today but it's been discussed in other forums, is the question of how to separate out how you allocate costs between mitigation and restoration.

CVPIA is clearly mitigation. So by taking it out of that equation of how to allocate costs, who pays for what, then you simplify at least that aspect of it.

So I just suggest those concepts.

CHAIRMAN MADIGAN: Thank you very much. I appreciate it.

MS. MCPEAK: Mr. Phipps, I think you have

PORTALE & ASSOCIATES DEPOSITION REPORTERS

Page 117 - Page 120

Page 121 advanced some very important questions. More importantly, I think that a lot of the 1 2 I would invite you to also answer them and 2 things that this group is considering and what CalFed is 3 3 anyone else who is providing input at this point. considering, including water transfers, land retirement, 4 It would be quite helpful to us if the Northern 4 reallocation for environmental purposes can have impacts 5 California Power Association could spell out the objectives that are very similar to what we are seeing in Mendota 5 that you want to see set, the performance standards, 6 6 during the drought and I think that we need to be thinking 7 et cetera, the ones that are most important to you and then 7 about how to assess and monitor and mitigate those impacts 8 also propose what you would like to see those be and why 8 in this process. and perhaps you can only start with the range of quantities 9 I think it's pretty self-evident that a lot of 10 to meet performance standards. 10 what is driving this process is economics and that we have 11 But it's that kind of higher degree of 11 to be very careful that we don't privilege one region or 12 specificity around the concepts that will move us to an 12 sector or type of community at the expense of another. 13 understanding where we have conflicts and be resolving 13 Thank you. them. So you were very thoughtful in your input. We'd 14 14 CHAIRMAN MADIGAN: Thank you. 15 like to request and invite some additional homework. 15 I have a note here that George Basin wishes to 16 JEFF PHIPPS: I certainly will participate 16 speak to the -- Mr. Basin? 17 17 and, again, I've been working with the CVPIA quite closely All right. Anybody else? and we have some experience there that I think could be 18 18 Yes, sir? It's your turn (indicating) for 19 19 real useful here that we need to tie in. sure. 20 CHAIRMAN MADIGAN: Thank you. 20 Thank you. 21 21 Mr. Hall. MR. OTTOWALLER: Good afternoon. 22 22 MR. HALL: I agree with the points that I know we're close to or past the lunch hour so 23 23 Mr. Phipps raised and certainly with Sunne's response. I'll keep my comments brief. 24 On the point about the CVPIA, I don't disagree. 24 My name is Steve Ottowaller. I work for Westlands Water District. 25 It clearly -- it took a different approach than CalFed is 25 Page 122 I'm not going to reiterate Dan Nelson's 1 on allocation of cost. 1

2 My understanding and I guess I would turn to 3 Lester for a response on this, is that it's existing law

4 and that you will try to make the CalFed program compatible 5

with the actions that it directs without necessarily

6 adopting the cost allocations formula that it prescribes

7 for the actions that it directs.

8 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SNOW: That's correct. 9 We just take it as law. That's the way that it exists and 10 we are dealing with it in that fashion.

11 CHAIRMAN MADIGAN: Thank you.

12 Members of the audience?

Miss Alvord (indicating), come forward, please.

14 ADRIENNE ALVORD: My name is Adrienne

15 Alvord.

13

16 I am the program coordinator of the Rural Water 17 Impact Network which is a program of the Community Alliance 18 of Family Farmers.

19 In your last mailing you should have received a 20 study entitled "93640, Community at Risk," which is a study 21 of Mendota during the 1987 to '92 drought.

22 I recommend that you all read it very closely. 23 It will help you to understand among other things the

24 passion and dedication of Mr. Petry in coming here year

after year and meeting after meeting.

Page 124

concerns because he speaks in part for Westlands as well as 2 a number of other agricultural water users, but I would 3

like to specifically address a couple of things related to 4

5 the alternatives and maybe give you an idea of where some

6 of this ag paranoia comes from. I agree I've not heard 7

anything say anybody is anti-ag.

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

One of the fundamental problems that I see and I've said it before but I'll say it again, the objective of this program that's described for water supply is reduce the mismatch between the needs of the exporters and the needs of the environment.

As long as you have that as your objective anybody can come along and say, "Well, by reducing the amount of water that we export we have met our objective." That's an improper objective and it doesn't meet the balance that's required under CalFed.

If you applied that same logic to some of the other objectives you could accomplish water quality concerns in CalFed by saying build more or better water treatment plants and that's not acceptable to the urban suppliers.

So I won't belabor that point but I think that's a key point that we will continue to make.

With respect to the alternatives and the

PORTALE & ASSOCIATES DEPOSITION REPORTERS

Page 121 - Page 124

Page 128

Page 125

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 questions that are up there, generally I think we could say
2 yes to most of them. Maybe with some qualifications.
3 With respect to the specific alternatives and

With respect to the specific alternatives and maybe I'm jumping ahead here but the alternatives described in the packet all contained a phrase within the description of water quality -- or the water use efficiency that says "The implementation of water use efficiency measures will substantially reduce the dependence on exports."

That is not a true statement. Certainly not when we now see that the determination has been made to temporary and permanent land conversions are not methods for improving water use efficiency. If you take out the component of land conversion or land retirement, then there is simply no way that you can say that you've reduced or that you can reduce the dependence on exports through the use of water use efficiency measures.

I won't try to get into the detail of the numbers, but there is just not enough water savings that can result from water use efficiency to say that you substantially reduce the dependence on the exports.

I guess I'd just have to say that in closing
that what we need to be doing here is reduce the mismatch
between what we hear and what we see on paper. What we see
on paper is what causes us the big problems. What we hear
in meetings and discussions gives us comfort and then we

there is a lot of things that are significant about

- 2 SB 900 but perhaps from our perspective the greatest
- 3 significance was simply in what happens when a broad based
- 4 coalition can come together and work hard on kind of a
- 5 mutual approach to problem solving. I think that's what we
- 6 saw in SB 900, which, in fact, passed the Assembly and the
- 7 Senate by the widest margin anybody can remember for a bond
  - issue, so I think that's a very upbeat sign.

And I wanted to ask both Steve Hall and Tom Graff, who were very much involved with that to make a few comments and observations about SB 900, the process, and what that means.

Steve, did you want to start?

MR. HALL: Okay.

groups are monolithic by any means.

Thank you, Lester.

It did, in fact, pass the Assembly by an almost unbelievable vote of 70 to three, and the Senate by a very substantial margin, 33 to four and was supported by the administration. This was one of those happy moments in California water history when -- you know, it's too simplistic to say that agricultural, urban and environmental interests came together because that is, in fact, what happened, but none of those three interest

So it was as much attributed to each of those

Page 126

see on paper things that cause us a lot of heartburn. And maybe ag is not the only one that sees those things.

So with that I'll close. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN MADIGAN: Thank you, sir.

All right. It's my expectation that you are all ready for lunch.

Therefore, we are going to break then come back to question number two after lunch. I do, however, want to ask Mr. Yaeger and his cohorts if we could try to summarize these remarks after lunch to see if we are headed in the right direction in terms of our comments for the CalFed

people.13

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

1 2

3

4

5

6

7

9

10

11

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

(Whereupon the noon recess was taken at 1:02 p.m., after which the following proceedings were had at 1:48 p.m.:)

CHAIRMAN MADIGAN: All right. We are back in session and we are going to take an item out of order because some of the key parties are here and, that is, a brief discussion and report on SB 900 and then we'll get back to the questions previously presented.

23 Mr. Snow.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SNOW: Yeah. I would just reiterate very briefly what I said this morning, that

three major interest groups getting their houses in order as it was on the whole consensus package.

And what was as impressive to me is that there were other interests that began to really focus on this that did have some impact on it and ultimately came on board, business and labor and lesser but still significant interest groups that weighed in.

This was an effort that spanned many, many months but like a lot of these things it reached critical mass once we had a deadline looming and really from the beginning of May until passage of the measure is when most of the activity took place.

There were intensive negotiations, particularly during July and really in a span of about ten days.

We negotiated the agreement, the conference committee approved it and it was passed and signed by the Governor, which is not to say that we could have skipped all of the preliminaries and done it in ten days. That's just not the way these things work.

A lot of work had gone into putting this thing together and so the ten days were really just sort of the climax of many months of work by all sides.

I can't say enough about Senator Jim Costa.
I am convinced that there is not another

legislator in this State serving in the State legislature

PORTALE & ASSOCIATES DEPOSITION REPORTERS

Page 125 - Page 128

Page 129

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

1 that could have done what he did.

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

7

8

9

10

11

16

17

18

19

2 And I also -- I have to take my hat off to all 3 three of the interest groups as well. They did an enormous 4 amount of work in a very short period of time in bringing 5 this together, and we already have a campaign being formed.

It will not be a major campaign in the sense that some bond issues are, but it will be probably a three media and radio campaign.

It will incorporate, at least my hope and expectation is, that it will incorporate representatives from all of the interest groups, environmental, agricultural, urban, business and labor, and anybody else who wants to climb on board, and there is no really organized opposition to the measure.

So the polling that we have done indicates the support among the public for this is high.

If we run a good low key campaign and if no organized opposition surfaces, I think the prospects are pretty good for passage.

I have to say when you read the ballot argument, you may or may not recognize this measure because pollsters tell us you've got about a minute with the average voter. That's how long he is going to spend with your ballot measure.

If you are lucky, that voter, he or she, will

Page 130

1 read the opening paragraph and look at who signed the measure for and against and will make a decision based on a

2 3 number of factors; how many other bond issues are on the

ballot, whether they had a good breakfast that day, you 4

5 know, lots of stuff, which don't necessarily have anything

to do with the bond measure. So those who wrote the ballot 6

arguments did so looking at what the public cares about.

Now, they didn't say things that weren't true, but they did emphasize those things that the public is most concerned about. That's why the ballot arguments read as they do.

12 Just a little truth in advertising here for 13 you.

14 And I also want to relate just sort of a 15 personal note.

After negotiating 18 hours a day for several days and then lobbying feverishly to get this thing passed, David Yardis and I, it was kind of surreal, I mean, we were doing some bonding or something. It was pretty weird stuff, but we agreed that we'd a whole lot rather work this

20 21 way than the way we have worked over the last several years

22 so with any luck we can not only pass SB 900 but work in

23 the same way on CalFed and its solution, negotiate hard,

make sure our respective interests are represented in 24

whatever is finally developed but then work hard to see

that it's implemented once the negotiation is complete.

2 CHAIRMAN MADIGAN: Who would know? Tom.

3 MR. GRAFF: I just have a few things to

4 add to what Steve just said.

5 I mentioned the legislative sponsors earlier 6 and I do think Senator Costa gets the lion's share of the 7 credit. I mean, he did a marvelous job in keeping people 8 together and keeping them focused and listening to all of 9 the interested parties.

As far as the consensus in the negotiation aspects of this I won't cite with the environmental people, but Senator Costa at the signing ceremony, which I witnessed, mentioned in particular Steve's name and then two representatives each of ag and urban constituencies, Dan Nelson and Tom Clark and Tim Quinn and Randy Canales (phonetic).

And I would have to say echoing what Jim said that we appreciate the work all of them did. And there is an unsung hero here who didn't get mentioned but who has a history in these issues and that's Betsy Reike.

The story is that at the Aqua Convention the ag and urban guys had a package that was completely satisfactory from their point of view but, they had -- hadn't been quite as effective at outreach as say Lester has been, and so Betsy urged them to perhaps give us

Page 132

a call and expand the negotiations, which they then did and the rest is history.

So even though she is out of state and supposedly out of California water matters she gets a little plug also.

As far as content is concerned I am not going to bore you with that but I do think that we should get a fairly comprehensive report really, not, you know, from Lester and from Council because there are some complicated legal issues that arise because of the way this ballot measure is written if it passes. It really from a State perspective directs CalFed to do a bunch of things and so on.

The reason Steve is a little concerned about that ballot argument which he didn't mention is that he signed it along with Jerry Merrill (phonetic) of PCL and Senator Costa.

So, hopefully, those three signatories will carry the day for us.

As far as the campaign is concerned, three different ballot measures have been endorsed by Valley papers, the LA Times and the San Francisco Chronicle but they all have the same number.

24 MR. HALL: That's the idea, Tom. 25 Revitalize the campaign.

PORTALE & ASSOCIATES DEPOSITION REPORTERS

Page 129 - Page 132

```
Page 133
 1
                 MR. GRAFF: So, you know, I don't know how
 2
     long that particular approach will succeed but we'll keep
 3
     working on it.
 4
              And lastly, one thing Steve did not mention,
 5
     which I think is important, and maybe worth kind of a task
     force of this Council or maybe not, I don't know, is there
 6
 7
     is a big effort now underway to get Federal matching funds
 8
     which is the major component of the proposal, and, you
 9
     know, we should, I think, lend whatever help we can to
10
     that.
11
             I guess it's sensitive. Public agencies can't
12
     technically campaign for ballot measures and I suppose that
13
     carries over to our body, but I think we can do Federal
                                                                        14
14
     cost share kind of stuff so maybe we should look into how
15
                                                                        15
     to do that.
16
                                                                        16
                 CHAIRMAN MADIGAN: Steve.
17
                                                                        17
                 MR. HALL: Well, I just -- since Tom felt
18
                                                                        18
     constrained and just being the statesman that he is I'll
19
                                                                        19
     mention three people, of many from the environmental
                                                                        20
20
     community who worked hard; David Yardis, Gary Bobker and
                                                                        21
21
     Cynthia Kohler were at the table pretty much around the
                                                                        22
22
     clock with us, and I also have to mention Tom's name.
23
                                                                        23
             We all kidded him because Yardis negotiated
                                                                        24
24
     this thing and then Tom showed up at the signing ceremony,
                                                                        25
25
     but the truth is there was a critical point in time when
                                                            Page 134
     the environmental community was very skeptical about this
 1
 2
     measure, in part for the reasons that Tom described through
 3
```

Page 135 myself, but Sunne suggested that you probably should head 2 up the effort in this group to try to develop that and make 3 sure that we get it. Tom. 4 MR. GRAFF: I'd be happy to work on it.

5 Rich Atwater has kind of emerged as a leader in this effort already from the water agency perspective. I think all of 6 7 us can work with him. That's fine with me. 8 (Inaudible)

9 CHAIRMAN MADIGAN: We will if you'll work 10 on that one that will be very helpful.

11 Thank you. Anyway, nice job. Good news. 12 Back to where we were.

Steve, are we ready to try to summarize what that first question elicited so that we can see if we have some sort of concurrence that, one -- you know, hopefully the approach taken to date was valid and that we are still supportive of that.

Two, that we are -- that this would represent the advice that we would have for its enhancement expansion or improvement during Phase II. I mean, ideally that's sort of where we come out of in this issue.

MR. YAEGER: Mr. Chairman, we have gone through and summarized from our notes as many of the comments that we got as we could. I hope that we faithfully reproduced those and I'm sure you will let us

Betsy Reike's involvement, and I was there, of course, but I have heard reports that Tom really weighed in with the environmental caucus and assured them that this was a deal worth trying to make if it could made.

So, you know, that's what we do with these folks once they reach a certain plane in our world, is we use them as shuttle negotiators, people like Tom and Betsy and others. So he served a vital role in that, really kind of kept things on track so we could make a deal. CHAIRMAN MADIGAN: Well, congratulations

13 to you both. I think that it is a significant day and it does, hopefully, bode favorably for the CalFed process as 15 well.

16 Tom.

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

14

17

19

20

21

MR. MADDOCK: Just for the record the 18 California Chamber of Commerce is activating their statewide network to support this proposition and have already taken a number of actions including, I believe, that they will be one of the signatories to the rebuttal 22 arguments.

23 CHAIRMAN MADIGAN: Thank you. 24 I think Tom, you're right about the issue of a

Federal matching money, and I wouldn't have suggested it

know if we have not.

13

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

But I'm going to ask Scott McCreary to kind of walk through point by point and summarize the comments.

SCOTT McCREARY: Thank you, Steve. MS. SELKIRK: I'm sorry to interrupt. CHAIRMAN MADIGAN: Yes, go ahead. Mary.

MS. SELKIRK: I believe that Gary Bobker was going to make his comments, too, to add to this.

Didn't we agree to that?

CHAIRMAN MADIGAN: Yes, we did.

Gary, did you want to speak specifically to this issue and if so, now would be the exact right time to do that.

MR. MATTHEWS: I did want to make some comments on it. Whether you want me to do that after Scott has finished his walk through or before, that's at your pleasure.

CHAIRMAN MADIGAN: Well, why don't we give you the advantage of hearing what the summary seems to be so that your comments can reflect that information.

SCOTT McCREARY: Okay. Well, our overall assessment here was that the BDAC members after considerable discussion and a lot of very thoughtful ideas gave this first answer a sort of flashing green light. That would be our summary.

PORTALE & ASSOCIATES DEPOSITION REPORTERS

Page 133 - Page 136

Page 136

1

7

8

9

10

11

12 II.

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

20

21

22

Page 139

Page 137

In other words, we think that you have told 2 staff to keep moving forward with the three alternatives, 3 but you have a number of concerns and clarifications that 4 you want to make sure are addressed. 5 There were a lot of questions and concerns

6 expressed about the level of detail. It seemed on balance BDAC members felt the level of detail was appropriate for this stage in the process but there were a lot of requests to be much more detailed and to create more specificity both about the alternatives and about the analysis as you go into Phase

There was also a request to take a second look at both the upper and the lower limits on the sizing of the alternatives.

There were questions asked of staff, "Well, how did you arrive at these particular sizes, what's the justification and rationale". So take a fresh look at

There were also, of course, a number of comments and questions from the agricultural community, and there were a number of, we think, very legitimate concerns raised, and the most important ones seem to be what is the intent and definition of the tool of land retirement, how will that be used. How will water transfers work and how

19

20

21

22

25

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

ا. چې شکيم

will the associated impacts be assessed in the second phase?

And we heard that from a lot of different quarters.

We also heard from a lot of different BDAC members the need to establish clear assurances and that really cuts across all of the different alternatives and a lot of the different common programs as well.

9 Related to the concern about assurances is that 10 of the CalFed nomenclature, if you will. There are a lot 11 of terms and definitions and we need to be very careful about what we mean. We need to clarify the meaning and 12 13 intent of a lot of these words and it was pointed out that 14 in some cases the presentations and policy deliberations of 15 the CalFed staff seemed to proceed ahead of the written 16 documents. So we need to kind of keep these policy 17 development and technical tools in a dual focus and make 18 sure that we -- make sure that the written documents keep pace with the policy deliberations. 19

And I think the other comment that we heard is that BDAC wants to be kept informed, especially on the policy side.

23 There were a lot of comments early on in the 24 discussion "These are very important decisions. You need to keep bringing them back to us".

We are fairly comfortable with where you are 2 right now but we want another chance to weigh in fairly 3 early on in Phase II.

4 So, Mr. Chairman, that would be my summary of 5 comments.

6 CHAIRMAN MADIGAN: All right. Let's start 7 from there. Comments? Tom. 8

MR. MADDOCK: Yeah.

9 CHAIRMAN MADIGAN: Tom and then Alex. 10 MR. MADDOCK: One point here which it 11 seemed to me emerged in listening to several people, Ben

12 Elson and others, is that as we embark in this next phase 13 it seems to me that there might be some effort to identify 14 some principles that if those principles are achieved in 15 the solutions that we come up with, then we can say, okay,

well, then this -- for example, water quality, what would 16 17 be the principles that we would use to measure whether we have achieved what we want in terms of water quality? 18

I think Dan Nelson talked a little bit about, well, where is the water supply? Well, as I was listening I'm not sure of what principles we would use to agree that whatever solution we come up with would do this for water

23 supply, whatever it is. So I suppose my suggestion would 24 be to add to this, Mr. Chairman, would be some effort

by -- and this is criticism of Lester, of course -- some --

Page 138

Page 140

CHAIRMAN MADIGAN: It's about time, yeah.

I feel better.

MR. MADDOCK: -- some effort by the staff to -- I know we talked about solution principles, but it really -- we really haven't gotten to these principles that control these four categories that we can say whatever solution -- we are coming up with alternative solutions and we are measuring the impacts.

But I for one would like to suggest that we add that to the list here to do.

> CHAIRMAN MADIGAN: All right. Thank you. Alex.

MR. HILDEBRAND: I would first concur in what Tom just said and beyond that I don't think the listing clearly addressed the question of our getting on quickly with the list of those assessments of pros and cons that have to be made during Phase II, not that we can make them all in Phase 1 but I think as we go into Phase II we've got to start with a clear recognition of what's going to be addressed in determining the impacts, pros and cons, interrelations and so forth so that they don't get overlooked.

As I said before, I think that those things may not be deliberately overlooked, but I think that there are interrelations that some of us see and impacts that some of

PORTALE & ASSOCIATES DEPOSITION REPORTERS

Page 137 - Page 140

Page 141

us see that others may not be aware of.

2 CHAIRMAN MADIGAN: All right. Thank you. 3

Mr. Bobker. Gary.

1

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

7

8

9

11

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

4 That's all right. I don't get any response

from anybody else either. Don't worry about it. 5

GARY BOBKER: Thank you.

Hopefully, the digestion process will be more favorable than the desire for lunch.

My name is Gary Bobker. I'm with the Bay Institute of San Francisco.

Before I talk about some of the key issues remaining since we started off this after lunch session with the discussion of SB 900 I'd just mention that I'd like to echo the comments of Tom and Steve. I think this is a very significant next step in reaching a solution.

It's something that hopefully all of the interests in this room will help to support.

I think it's very appropriate that significant public monies should go toward what will be, as Dick said, perhaps the most ambitious restoration program in this country.

And I anticipate that additional public monies will also be added to that pot. We will be looking for Federal monies in a cautionary agreement for the monies identified for CalFed in SB 900.

Page 142

I think one thing that CalFed does need to look at over the -- during the Phase II process is the appropriate water user contribution to the restoration program.

5 I think it's clear that there is -- it's not 6 appropriate for water users to bear the whole cost of that by any means and that's one of the reasons why SB 900 was a very important move but there is an obligation on the part of water users to bear some of the general restoration 10 costs both in -- you can define it in many ways, the benefits you get from the increased certainty because of a 12 healthier ecosystem or the fact that in some ways it's 13 delayed mitigation for projects which were not mitigated 14 fully earlier.

In either case it's something that I look forward to seeing how CalFed will deal with that issue.

Let me start with getting back to the -- what was the most controversial issue that we discussed this morning, and that's the land retirement issue.

I think that it's somewhat unfortunate the way that the land retirement issue was introduced into the CalFed program and I think that some of the earlier alternatives because they had such an over-reliance on large scale land retirement as a water use efficiency

measure, that it got appropriately a very negative

reaction.

1

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2 I'm a little concerned that in response to that 3 negative reaction that we may be now underestimating the 4 importance of land retirement and land conversion as an 5 important tool.

It's a tool that's been identified in a lot of areas as very important in getting to a solution. It's important that we not let it drop off the screen and land conversion can mean a lot of different things. I think the earlier emphasis on permanent land retirement was part of the problem. The environmental community wants to make sure that permanent land retirement as an important measure for addressing water quality issues, which I think that Lester said earlier, that would continue to be, will be an important part of the Bay-Delta solution.

And we believe that there is significant amounts of acreage above the core action levels that were identified earlier. I think it would be necessary to solve the problems on the west side. But in addition to the permanent land retirement, there is also land conversion issues in terms of -- there is a lot of strategies available to us to manage water. Some of them are temporary land retirement. They are temporary land conversion, using fallowing and other things and I'm glad to hear that that's going to continue to be part of the

water supply management toolbox.

I think that there may be times when permanent land retirement is a part of that toolbox. It should certainly not be the top of the list but we should be looking at all of these tools and seeing where they are appropriate in doing land retirement or land conversion to forms of agriculture which perhaps have less impact on the environment. We need not to put blinkers on our thoughts about land retirement and land conversion.

I think it's also important that when we look at the water supply issues, that Steve Ottowaller was a little critical of the reduce and mismatch between supply and demand and the environmental community obviously has a different take on that.

We think it's extremely important at that we look at ways to manage our system better and, you know, that's -- we need to look at all of the tools. Some of those tools are going to be reducing demands. Some of them are going to be increasing supply. We can't make the assumption, though, that because there are opportunities to perhaps increase supplies that those supplies are going to go to one sector.

We have some issues in terms of where the benefits should go from when we have the ability to use water or shift it around the system. I think CalFed is

Page 144

PORTALE & ASSOCIATES DEPOSITION REPORTERS

Page 141 - Page 144

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

going to be wrestling with that. It's very unclear how that's going to come out so it's appropriate to look at all 3 of those different strategies.

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

24

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

storage facilities.

One way of helping us to look at that strategy is in terms of demand management is look at pricing options and I think that it's important in doing the Phase II evaluation that the CalFed staff begin to look at how the components of the different alternatives are going to affect the price of water. Many of the different -- the costs of the particular element, water transfers, the market, may affect the price of water and depending on the price of water that's going to affect demand and depending on demand it may affect what you do. So it's an iterative process that you really need to incorporate, I think, into your consideration of water supply reliability.

One additional -- another issue involves the question of environmental water.

We've been encouraged to see that the identification of flows for the environment has now been acknowledged as a need in terms of the ecosystem restoration Common Program, although we continue to be 22 concerned that the flow objectives for ecosystem 23 restoration, like the other restoration objectives need to be articulated better. That's a horse that's been beat a 25 lot and I am not going to beat it again here, but it's a

Page 147

final -- next to final point is I just wanted to note for

2 folks that Dan (indicating) was earlier talking about his 3 interest in seeing the isolated facility conveyance

4 component of the third alternative be -- he was concerned

5 about the sizing of that.

> I think that there is a lot of agreement among the stakeholder communities about putting some limits on the size of the facilities and I want to remind you that back in February the stakeholders did recommend that an isolated facility be considered but not be sized greater than the combined conveyance of the State and Federal Water Projects.

That was a working document. No one was signing off on a position there and all of our positions are evolving and I certainly -- I think we need to listen to Dan and other folks. But I want to stress that I think there is a lot of agreement among folks and perhaps some of the other water users would like to speak to that.

The final comment gets to the Delta component of the common programs, the ecosystem restoration and system integrity programs.

The environmental water caucus in particular and at times with the stakeholders has made a lot of recommendations to CalFed about ecosystem restoration, the principles that ought to be used, the large scale that's

Page 146

continuing concern, but the point I want to raise here is 1 2 that there seems to be a big emphasis in a lot of the CalFed material on the use of new storage facilities as a 3 4

source of environmental water. That may, in fact, may be an important component of providing new environmental water to the system. It may not. The concern I have is that as we said with storage in general, that we should be looking at institutional and nonstructural sources of water storage for all purposes and sources of new water before we look at the structural elements. There's kind of a hierarchy there and I think that there are elements, such as the acquisition of water, which is an important part of the CalFed elements, you know. We do acknowledge that the purchase for water in the San Joaquin, although I think maybe that there is some overestimates there, but I think that the main point here is that acquiring water throughout the system, acquiring water rights, water transfers, conjunctive use, are all potential sources of new water as well and we need to look at those very thoroughly and then

make our choices based on what the best sources of new

water are. That's particularly important because of the

The final point -- well, actually, not the

potential impacts associated with construction of new

necessary that we know from restoration efforts as well as

2 specific recommendations for potential areas for habitat

3 restoration, and I think that the restoration program has

made a good start at addressing a lot of those issues and

5 included a lot of good elements and some of them of very

6 good scale, particularly upstream and downstream of the 7

Delta.

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

We continue to have issues, but the CalFed and BDAC have established the processes to deal with that, such as the restoration work group. So we look forward to continuing to resolve those issues.

But in particular, the in-Delta component of the ecosystem restoration continues to trouble us. The scale and scope of what's being considered in the Common Program doesn't seem to us to be adequate to really restore the health of the Delta ecosystem.

We are talking about what was a vast system of freshwater tidal marshes, backwater swamps, upland -associated upland habitats.

That's really only got fragments of that kind of original ecosystem left and we can't get that ecosystem back but we need to make sure that we have a mosaic of habitats throughout the Delta, which are on a scale large enough to really make a difference and I don't think that the components that are there now in the CalFed Common

PORTALE & ASSOCIATES DEPOSITION REPORTERS

Page 145 - Page 148

Page 148

1

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

Program really do that.

1

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25

1

3

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2 Also there is also another issue -- and we made 3 some suggestions about what proper levels of restoration in 4 the Delta should be.

What I want to point out here is that there is an intimate connection between what you do with the Delta ecosystem restoration and what you do with the -- how you address Delta system integrity, the reliance of the levees.

Stabilization of the Delta as it is now is something that's troubling but probably not sustainable. What we would encourage the program to do is to think bigger, be more ambitious, and begin to look at ways -- think in long-term ways that over the next hundred years or more we can begin to open up parts of the Delta to dramatic restoration opportunities and at the same time

Our position on that is evolving. It's a very difficult subject. It's a controversial one.

reduce the risk of catastrophic failure.

We will work to explore seeking consensus with Delta interests on that, and I think that the in-Delta interest, all of the ag folks have expressed a real interest in addressing habitat restoration of the Delta, but there is still a big gap because of what we see as the necessary scale.

Certainly, what we'd like to start thinking

Page 151

MS. MCPEAK: Thank you. Thank you, Gary. 2 CHAIRMAN MADIGAN: Thank you, Garv.

3 Mr. Yaeger, have you amended your notices as a 4

result of the comments that you have heard here to further 5 expand and identify the concerns of this group?

6 MR. YAEGER: We will expand the list we've 7 already put together and I think the intention is to put 8 that together in a written communication from the Chair to 9 CalFed, passing on the advice of BDAC to the CalFed 10 management group.

CHAIRMAN MADIGAN: Before I ask for consensus, Ann, I'll call on you.

MS. NOTTHOFF: Yeah, I just wanted to pick up on some of the earlier public comment about the role of existing laws in terms of developmental solutions to CalFed. I want to reinforce the fact that some of the comments have been made earlier that the package that we have in front of us, I think, is impressively responsive, and the process has been very open so far and takes into account the baseline of existing laws.

I did want to note an item of concern to NRDC, and that is that recent actions by the Resources Agency, which is a primary co-sponsor of this process, certainly, cause us concern in terms of the philosophy which was recently articulated by the Resources Agency regarding

Page 150

about is that in the areas like the peat soil areas of the Delta, perhaps agriculture is not sustainable in the 2 long-term. We should begin to phase out or reduce

4 agricultural activities or restrict agricultural activities 5

to certain types of agriculture, begin to look at ways that

6 we cannot only control but reverse subsidence. 7

That's a difficult task but one over a long period which would open up exciting new possibilities for habitat restoration, considering how dynamic the system is and expected things like everything from development to global warming and sea level rise.

We are going to need to have large new areas of habitat in the Delta.

In other areas of the Delta with mineral soils, agriculture is sustainable and reconciling environmentally sound agriculture in the Delta with significant portions of the Delta that would be converted to various types of habitat is, I think, appropriate, and we'd like to see the program address that on a scale again that is going to get to a solution. Right now we do not think that the scale is going to get us there. I think with that that covers most of the key issues that the environmental water caucus has identified.

24 I will submit written comments that discuss these in a little more detail.

coastal zone development.

2 And how we -- how NRDC interprets the comments 3 that were recently made in terms of managing complex 4 resource issues here in the State is that if there were 5 money interests and Government agencies can agree on

6 solutions to these complex problems, that that performs a

7 basis for consensus and agreement, and I think that I would 8

hate to see this process be affected by that type of 9 approach. I think this process has been quite noteworthy

10 in its commitment to complying -- developing solutions that

11 comply with the Central Valley Improvement Act, the State

12 and Federal Endangered Species Act and the Clean Water Act

13 and has been quite clear and I just think it's important to

14 reinforce the fact that the standards of those laws are 15 nonnegotiable to NRDC and many other environmental

16 representatives as part of this process, and I think that

17 there -- I just was kind of a note of caution to some of

18 the more recent controversies that have been surrounding

19 resource management in California, and wanted to, you know,

20 give a hand to this process, which seems to have evaded

21 those controversies up to date, but I think it's important

22 to keep an eye on it.

23 Thanks. 24

CHAIRMAN MADIGAN: All right. Thank you.

Yes, Roberta.

PORTALE & ASSOCIATES DEPOSITION REPORTERS

Page 149 - Page 152

Page 152

BD	AC MEETING Conde	nse	It ™ JULY 19, 1996
	Page 153		Page 155
1	MS. BORGONOVO: I wanted to make a comment	1	to deal with those particular components and maybe at the
2	about financing restoration but I'm perfectly happy to make	2	same time we can deal with the second part of that, is
3	it after the finance group report since some of the issues	3	conceptually looking at a phased implementation then a
4	came up yesterday.	4	reasonable way to proceed.
5	CHAIRMAN MADIGAN: All right. Let's see	5	Because, obviously, if it is, if this is a good
6	if we have some sort of consensus on the summary that Scott	6	way to do it and that's a good way to stage, that's the
7	and Steve presented, recognizing that these would be the	7	kind of the way that we would structure the analysis in
8	comments that we would then take as a part of our	8	Phase II.
9	recommendations and suggestions to CalFed.	9	CHAIRMAN MADIGAN: Alex.
10	Do you all feel comfortable enough or would you	10	MR. HILDEBRAND: Is it clear that we are
11	like to wander through them one more time here?	11	agreeing that the common programs that have been listed are
12	MR. MADDOCK: In other words, the comments	12	appropriate for examination but that we would hold final
13	are going to go with the understanding that not everybody	13	judgment on them until the assessments are made?
14	subscribes to each individual statement?	14	EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SNOW: Absolutely.
15	CHAIRMAN MADIGAN: Correct. This is an	15	CHAIRMAN MADIGAN: All right.
16	accurate reflection of concerns of the group	16	Richard.
17	MR. MADDOCK: What you're asking is that	17	MR. IZMIRIAN: I'm in concern that
18	this represents or reflects the concerns?	18	question two there that demand management is not there.
19	CHAIRMAN MADIGAN: Right.	19	Gary Bobker just enumerated a lot of the
20	MR. MADDOCK: Thank you.	20	elements of the water demand function. Water use
21	CHAIRMAN MADIGAN: Okay.	21	efficiency may be part of that demand function but it
22	Yes, Ann?	22	doesn't substitute for it.
23	MS. NOTTHOFF: I would just like to	23	There is no agreeable definition of water use
24	endorse the caveat that our concern with the ecosystem	24	efficiency except that it does not include land retirement.
25	restoration Common Program may need to go farther than it	25	I don't know how the decision was made to drop
	Page 154		Page 156
1	does currently.	1	the demand management for water use efficiency.
2	CHAIRMAN MADIGAN: All right. Seeing no	2	I don't think it was made based on discussion
3	great objections to that Roberta, is this a great	3	here or in the work group. I would like to see demand
4	objection?	4	management returned up there.
5	MS. BORGONOVO: No.	5	EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SNOW: And to
6	CHAIRMAN MADIGAN: Oh, good. Seeing no	6	specifically accomplish having a place to put permanent ag
7	great objection to it, is this okay then?	7	land retirement?
8	MS. BORGONOVO: Is this our only chance to	8	MR. IZMIRIAN: That and a number of other
9	give our input into CalFed?	9	elements of demand management.
10	CHAIRMAN MADIGAN: Well, we've only dealt	10	EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SNOW: I'm not sure
11	with the first question so far.	11	what those other elements are.
12	Okay. Mr. Snow.	12	MR. IZMIRIAN: I think Gary very nicely
13	EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SNOW: This is the last	13	summarized them a little while ago.
14	chance, Roberta. You guys will never meet again.	14	EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SNOW: Okay.
15	I heard somebody say "promise".	15	CHAIRMAN MADIGAN: Eric.
16	This was just the first question.	16	MR. HASSELTINE: Lester, I wanted to speak
17	Now, you'll notice that in answering the first	17	to the common programs and follow-up on a variety of
18	question we've hit quite a few of these others.	18	comments that have been made so far today and I guess
19	In fact, quite a few of the caveats that were	19	primarily in response to what Jeff Phipps brought up, too;
20	given really relate to what needs to be analyzed in Phase	20	in terms of objectives within these common programs.
21	II so I think we've covered a fair amount of ground, but I	21	What we have is four categories of actions
22	do want to focus on the next two questions really which	22	really. So we have a variety of actions that are split
23	deal with the Common Program.	23	among four categories.

And essentially is having this Common Program

24

Page 153 - Page 156

All of which are intended to provide some

24 25 that evolved through the Workshop process a reasonable way 25 improvement to the system or to take us along the path, and

Page 157

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

there is language in here that indicates we'll start out with modest efforts and then gradually increase them as the process proceeds.

The difficult problem that I see and I think it gets to some of the questions that Judith raised about confidence and Tom Maddock raised, also, in terms of affordability is one of our solution principles and something that came up in our finance working group is trying to assess really when you're applying scarce resources to an overall effort like this, what are you really getting for your money as you're spending it?

How far along the line does each dollar take

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

And if you don't have something to measure your accomplishment in each of these categories of common programs by, it becomes very, very difficult, and at least one cursory way of doing that is setting some objectives and trying to see how close you are getting to your objectives as you put together these combinations of actions, but I don't see that in here anywhere. I'm left kind of hanging here sort of understanding that, yes, we are taking these actions because everybody agrees that they contribute something, but we don't really know how far we want to go with that and as we get into the ultimate question of how we are going to try to pay for this and

1 of the break point cost effectiveness.

2 If you can achieve a certain level of 3 water quality for the first five hundred million dollar 4 investment and for the next billion dollar investment you 5 only get a one percent increase in water quality, well, 6 there is a break point of some sort there and I think the 7 combination of the analysis of what we can actually achieve 8 for the implementation and a better quantification of the 9 objectives or improved quantification of the objectives 10 gets at the issue that a number of people have been 11 discussing this morning.

So I think perhaps even as early as our next meeting we may want to go back and revisit the objectives that we considered roughly nine months ago and look at them and see how they look in comparison to where we are with the rest of the program right now.

CHAIRMAN MADIGAN: Roberta.

MS. BORGONOVO: I wanted to go back to what Richard brought up when he was talking about demand management.

I'd just go back to my own organization's position on protecting the Bay Delta and, that is, that there is a need to set limits on the amount of water to be exported through or around the Delta.

And so I think I hear Richard talking about the

Page 158

implement it we don't really know how far to push it or how to measure the cost effectiveness of each of these actions if we don't have some sort of measuring stick.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SNOW: I think there is a couple of things that get at that issue.

One is you may recall in the early phases of the program, maybe our either second or third meeting, we dealt with objectives.

We started off talking about problems and then we had the four basic objectives for the four resource areas, and then underneath the four were, I believe, 14 secondary objectives and then underneath the 14 -- I can't remember the total number under that -- but we have actually developed fairly specific objectives, not all quantified in the detail that you are suggesting, and I think that on that step in the evolution of those objectives is to try and develop as many quantifications as possible.

Now, we are clearly focusing on that in the
ecosystem program and trying to come up with targets for
different types of habitat and so I think turning those
into -- I mean, the way of this discussion is using the
concept of objectives, it's like a performance measure you
are and I think also what we will see out of the Phase II
analysis, the term I would use to characterize it it's kind

Page 160

- generic demand continually continuing to take freshwater
- 2 flows out of the Delta and I think that that's what I hear
- 3 him saying. When that got dropped that concept that would
- 4 not be a legitimate goal to continue to protect that
- 5 freshwater outflow that's needed throughout all of these
- 6 practices. That kind of thinking is now over in water use
- 7 efficiency and it's not the same concept and so I think
- 8 that I also would like to see that addressed in the generic
- 9 term.

I understand that I think probably the reason we dropped it is because demand side management has a particular term for certain urban water agencies when their talking about customer use, but I think that it has these larger implications that should be at least talked about.

CHAIRMAN MADIGAN: Judith and then Alex. I just received stunning news from Sunne here and I'd like to pass it on to you when I get a chance.

She reports that our staff has, in fact, talked to the management of this building and they report that it is a Sacramento County ordinance that precludes them from turning down the air conditioning.

I'd just pass this along to you.

Lester.

(Off-the-record comments)

PORTALE & ASSOCIATES DEPOSITION REPORTERS

Page 157 - Page 160

Page 161 1 MS. REDMOND: Jumping back to the 2 discussion about finances, I would just like to 3 encourage -- I think that when the Common Program approach 4 was announced, that it helped to clarify a lot of what was 5 going on. It was a helpful structure for me, at least, and 6 I would -- I think that in the past there has been such 7 emphasis on other approaches, you know, conveyance systems 8 and storage systems and so forth, that many times those 9 things get a lot of the attention and definitely they often 10 10 get a lot of the financial resources. 11 11 So when -- the commitment here is to extensive 12 12 levels of all of these common programs and I think what 13 13 that implies is also a greater degree of resource 14 14 allocation to those common programs than we've seen in the 15 past. 16 Generally -- I mean, those things could be very 17 17 expensive if they are done right and we haven't really seen 18 them done right in the past, I think, so this would 18 19 19 be -- this is a real opportunity to put some resources into 20 20 those common programs and do those things right and see 21 21 where that gets us because in the past the resources have, 22 22 I think, gone into other areas. 23 23 But I would just encourage really thinking 24 24 ambitiously about what we can achieve with the common 25 25 programs. Page 162

improvements in the ecosystem, ecosystem restoration that

JULY 19, 1996

2 are being undertaken by the CVPIA restoration fund in 3 category three.

4 There clearly are water use efficiency measures 5 that are being undertaken by both urban and agricultural 6 agencies so we intend -- I mean, the extent to which we can

7 influence those activities so they contribute to the 8 long-term solution, we are doing that so there is

9 implementation that, in fact, is going on.

I forget the first part of your question.

MR. GRAFF: Yeah.

I mean maybe a longer term question is do you anticipate that once the EIS is out, the program continues and becomes an implementing entity?

15 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SNOW: No, not 16 necessarily.

I think that's the issue that needs to be evaluated as part of the implementation strategy, is what's the best way to assure these things happen and that they -- everything moves forward linked together?

And that's part of the assurances effort, whether a mere contract between parties, make sure these flow forward, or if their needs to be institutional modifications, but there is no assumed role for CalFed or BDAC beyond completion of the EIR/EIS.

1

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2 MR. HILDEBRAND: I'd just like to 3 reiterate, if I didn't make it clear before, that I 4 strenuously object to CalFed's fostering a reallocation of 5 water from one broad purpose and use to another unless and 6 until this body specifically agrees to some specific 7 measure in that regard. 8 CHAIRMAN MADIGAN: Okay. Thank you. 9 Tom. 10 MR. GRAFF: I have a generic question, 11 which is that both of these refer to development of a 12 program -- one refers to development of a program, the 13 other to implementation, and I understand -- I mean, CalFed 14 is a planning entity really. I understand how it can 15 develop a program, but how -- what is the strategy to get 16 from development of programs to implementation of programs, 17 particularly, the ones that are, you know, underway soon, I 18 mean, before a final EIS is completed, for example? 19 Or are we not going to do anything as a program 20 until that's done? 21

CHAIRMAN MADIGAN: Thank you. Alex.

1

22

23

24

25

the CalFed Program.

Page 164 But the issue that you are asking about is what

we specifically want to evaluate when it comes to this 2 3 third question, is a staged implementation, where you

clearly have distinct stages, packages of actions that 4

would be implemented, kind of as a package and then

subsequently additions made to it so it's staged over a 6 7 longer period of time.

MR. GRAFF: You mind if I bog this up a little bit?

Dan Nelson is in the audience and he can

comment on this, too.

We've been having problems recently on the drainage issue and one of the kind of areas of disagreement is that there was a consensus effort that held together pretty well and produced a report on the drainage program with the advisory committee that was balanced and supportive of the program and then it disappeared and there is big debate about whether implementation has been successful or not with the Valley interests more or less saying, yeah, we are moving along doing an lot of good things. The environmental interests saying what's happened? Very little and no kind of forum really to decide which is true or which has the valid perspective. CHAIRMAN MADIGAN: Sunne. MS. MCPEAK: Tom, I would just comment

PORTALE & ASSOCIATES DEPOSITION REPORTERS

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SNOW: There are,

certainly, actions that can and will be undertaken prior to

completion of the EIR/EIS that contribute to the goals of

And just several examples, there are

Page 161 - Page 164

6

7

8

9

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

Page 167

Page 165 that it is my understanding that part of the scope of the 2 work group assigned to look at assurances would be to take 3 on that kind of aspect of ongoing either oversight or 4 aggressive monitoring until such institutions come into 5 place.

I think we would all want to know that there was going to be the sustained momentum from the time that a decision is made. So if that is not part of it, Mr. Chairman, we should assign that out.

10 Steve had raised an issue earlier about some 11 issues that should be looked at by the work group on 12 institutional assurances, but --

MR. GRAFF: Maybe Roger and Michael have already looked at this, too. I don't know.

MS. MCPEAK: I mean, it needs to happen. We can't just let it -- what you're saying is make sure that we have as part of our task to see how you sustain follow-up, implementation and momentum.

I was answering pretty quickly when you were asking the question, saying no, not necessarily because we as a group here haven't been asked to go on to what will be clearly some additional agencies or organizations, some may not even yet in place or contemplated that will have the responsibility for implementing and spending money. We

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

other thoughts about this group we need to have breakfast 1 2 or something. 3

Okay.

Roger and then Stu.

MR. STRELOW: I think people have appropriately focused hard on the question of ensuring sustained effort, ensuring commitments and as Sunne pointed out, the assurances group really has to look very hard at this.

I think assuming, as I do, that there is very substantial consensus on the need for that mechanism, both as part of our deliberations and as part of any ultimate program, I would just like to get back to the point about staged implementation.

If you have that kind of effective oversight to ensure that commitments are met, that the programs don't just kind of dribble off somewhere, with that important assumption then I would like to endorse heartily the notion of phased and staged implementation because at the level of broad objectives there wouldn't be any real debate probably, but an awful lot of individual efforts or commitments that may look great at one point, you know, five, ten years later there may be a better way of doing it or something.

An example Lester gave, you may get to a point

Page 166

folks who would be overseeing those kinds of

implementations but to sustain the forward movement and 2

weren't expecting that this is going to be the group of

oversight until there are those agencies has to be, I 3

4 think, a part of we would charge ourselves with doing.

CHAIRMAN MADIGAN: Michael or Roger?

MR. MANTELL: Roger and I were just talking about this and obviously as some of the materials indicate any solution that is going to be effective has to be implementable and as part of what is implementable is, you know, what institutional resources and staying power is going to be available to carry it through.

This is an issue that CalFed is going to give great deal of thought to. It's entirely conceivable that entity, and, frankly, while it's not currently within this group's charter at the appropriate time it's very conceivable that CalFed would ask for input from a group -- from this group as we get closer to figuring out what the solution is, is how best to implement it and through what institutional mechanisms, but I think it's

12 13 14 some sort of CalFed arrangement or variation on what we currently have could become the long-term implementing 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 a -- well, it has to be something that we are constantly thinking about. It's premature to engage in a full range 23 of discussions about, I think, because we're not --24 25 CHAIRMAN MADIGAN: Before you have any

Page 168

where additional expenditures on a particular course would

2 get very little additional benefit and would preclude you

3 from doing other things that you now see could be even

4 better in the same category, moving towards, say,

5 environmental restoration. So I would hate to think that

6 we felt smart enough right here and now to say we know

exactly how much of each of these things we ought to do.

We know the kinds of things. We can in many cases get, you know, a pretty good rough magnitude but we sure ought to leave the process with some flexibility to adjust provided it has this overlay of accountability.

CHAIRMAN MADIGAN: Stu.

MR. PYLE: I'm glad to see the subject of implementation come up before this group.

I brought this up in the ecosystem restoration work group, and I felt that it's really necessary to develop the administrative program for carrying out this implementation, but I don't think that it's enough to merely outline the physical program that proposes the restoration or the programs or whatever it is in terms of restoration, but somehow you'd have to get all the way through this process of how as the technical people with the expertise go along, how they propose programs, how they get them approved, how they carry them on into approval and authorization or an implementation of funding, discussion,

PORTALE & ASSOCIATES DEPOSITION REPORTERS

Page 165 - Page 168

BD	AC MEETING Conde	nse	It <sup>™</sup> JULY 19, 1996
	Page 169		Page 171
1	finally back to the review and the reworking of these as	1	Bob.
2	they go on over the decades.	2	MR. RAAB: I just wanted to say amen to
3	And I think so far the CalFed has seen itself	3	what Stewart Pyle just said.
4	looking just at delineating this physical and operational	4	CHAIRMAN MADIGAN: About the wind?
5	program that hopefully will result in the restoration or	5	MR. RAAB: About the wind. I was on
6	the action of improving water supplies, levees and so	6	another level.
7	forth, but I think also somehow they should endorse somehow	7	I'm on the level of management.
8	dealing with this structure, the administrative structure	8	As I said in the restoration Committee meetings
9	that oversees it that brings together all of the agencies.	9	hearing, the scientific information is raising my knowledge
10	Somehow you have to outline the role of who	10	of habitat issues from two percent to three percent but I
11	this Agency is and are we automatically assuming that	11	keep thinking, gee, I wish I knew how we could get into a
12	CalFed is going to be here, is it going to be the	12	management mode on all of this, so that we can see some
13	overriding Agency that administers this thing over the long	13	kind of practical application of all of this theoretical
14	haul?	14	knowledge which I feel is getting to the point where it's
15	And I think there is just a lot of things in	15	almost getting to be analysis to the point of paralysis.
16	this administrative program that should be brought up.	16	So I just want to second what Stewart says.
17	And if I sound like I'm losing my voice I'm	17	CHAIRMAN MADIGAN: All right. Audience,
18	sitting in about a five naught wind (laughter) at a 45	18	this is an appropriate time for those of you who wish to be
19	degrees temperature here.	19	heard on this particular subject.
20	MR. STRELOW: Don't want to violate the	20	And if you've not left your name and address,
21	law.	21	we'd appreciate it.
22	MR. PYLE: Sunne, maybe you asked the	22	Mr. Petry.
23	wrong question. Did you ask if they'd turn it down or turn	23	MR. PETRY: What size jacket do you wear,
24	it up?	24	Roger?
25	MS. MCPEAK: No, I think they have been	25	MR. THOMAS: It is (indicating) It's
	Page 170		Page 172
1	trying to do it.	1	comfortable.
2		2	MR. PETRY: Well, he must be under the
3	(Off-the-record discussion)	3	heat because he's not wearing his jacket.
4		4	But, anyhow, I'd like to give comment in
5	CHAIRMAN MADIGAN: Dan, you're next.	5	regards to the San Luis drain and I know it's a touchy
6	DAN NELSON: Yes. Regarding the staging	6	subject, but it does reflect the area that I live in and it
7	of implementation	7	drastically reflects on it not only with our water quality
8	CHAIRMAN MADIGAN: Use the mike, would	8	but also with the fish in the Mendota Pool.
9	you?	9	It appears that the San Luis drain is going
10	DAN NELSON: Excuse me.	10	through our aquifer and bleeding off in the Mendota Pool,
11	Regarding the staging of implementation, there	11	and if you understand the hydrology of the water the way it
12	was a guiding principle that was used in the development of	12	runs, they reverse the flows, and they take these bad
13	SB 900 that I think is applicable here.	13	waters back up by the giant James Bypass and that goes
14	And, that is, again, out of the three things	14	south of our area and they irrigate with that, the San

20 to do, but I think it's one that we want to do with that 21 guiding principle in mind, that we have to be very

that we are all trying to accomplish, supply, quality and

ecosystem restoration, that all of these components move

together in a balanced way, one not getting out in front of

implementation is a very practical one and one that we want

the other, and I think the notion of staging the

22 cognizant that we are doing this in a balanced way and that

23 we are not just implementing one statement and leaving the 24 others behind.

25 CHAIRMAN MADIGAN: Thank you.

15

17

18

19

Joaquin and in that area. Not only that when four entities pull out of

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

the Mendota Pool it goes into the Central Valley area and they irrigate the lands with that.

Now, what goes down past the Tracy pumping plants, it doesn't happen too often, and it should go down to the top of the sea intrusion, but what does go down there doesn't help the estuary neither. And we are talking 1700 pounds of totally dissolved solids in that aquifer in the city of Mendota in 1995. We are talking about 489 parts of selenium coming out of the Pinoche Hills.

PORTALE & ASSOCIATES DEPOSITION REPORTERS

Page 169 - Page 172

Page 173

3

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

20

21

22

23

24

25

implement this program.

These flows that come out of the Pinoche Hills have a lot of man-made diversions, particularly between the Fairfax Avenue and Mendota Pool.

We had a 1300 cubic second foot flow coming down in 1995 that carried silt, selenium and debris, rattle snakes and everything else into the Mendota Pool.

7 So how can we attain water quality in the 8 Central Valley region when they are irrigating those lands 9 in the Central Valley region with the waters coming from 10 the Pinoche Hills and out of the sub-surface area from the San Luis drain. 11

And how they are going to rectify that, I don't know, other than continuing the San Luis drain or additional flows to dilute it from Millerton Lake.

I don't have time to tell you what all the benefits are but I will put it in writing, what additional flows in the San Luis drain and the San Joaquin River coming out of Millerton Lake or above Millerton Lake.

The benefit where I'm concerned is with the fish.

21 In the past two, three years ago there was 22 ringworms between the skin and the flesh. Now the 23 ringworms are in the guts.

24 Now, this is a serious matter with me because 25 I'm retired. I've got nothing else to do but come to

concern about it. Thank you.

2 CHAIRMAN MADIGAN: Thank you, Mr. Petry.

Is there anybody else in the audience?

4 Yes (indicating).

5 BILL DUNN: There is just a few comments 6 that I'd make here on various elements of the subject, 7 based mostly on the fact that I've been involved in the water business here for about 45 years. 8

I think Clair Hill is the only guy around here that's been involved longer than I have, but, at any rate, I'd like to make a few comments here, especially in the matter of water supply.

I think there is a need to evaluate each element as to how it affects the water supply.

As I look at a lot of these things they are negative and you add all of the negatives, especially, the environmental things, not that I'm opposed to them, but I think it should be understood what the impact is on water supply, and these should all be added up and then when you get to the matter of areas or programs that involve positive supplies, how really feasible are they, how much do they really involve?

One of the things that I'm concerned about, and there is something that's felt is a big long-term solution, especially in drought years, has been the matter of

Page 174

Sacramento and fight for water and go fishing and I could be fishing today if it wasn't for what's going on now.

2 3 CHAIRMAN MADIGAN: Couldn't we all

4 (affirmative nod).

1

2

3

4

5

6

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

1

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

17

18

19

22

23

MR. PETRY: There is a need for additional flows and it will resolve a lot of problems.

And I'm hopeful that the understanding will come about to that.

There is so many benefits from additional water. There could be additional flows of high quality water to flush out the grasslands. It wouldn't have to come from the Delta.

There could be additional flows to -- for the fish in the San Joaquin River.

15 Four, five years ago I was catching salmon in Los Banos. Why can't they go another 35 miles? 16

There is no reason that we can't have that.

Now, if we could get a salmon run coming back again, would we have to have spawning farms for them when 19

20 we bring them back to a natural stance, like they were in 21 the beginning. This is what we need to go back to.

How much money would we save there?

We need to get a population of fish in the

Mendota slough so I won't have to come to the Sacramento 24 Delta to fish and I think there needs to be a lot of

Page 176 conjunctive groundwater use and in theory the thing sounds 2 great and it is great and it's really a major solution of

3 long-term water supply for drought periods.

It's well-known that we send a lot of water into the ocean during wet or normal years and then don't have enough during the dry seasons and the groundwater is a good theoretical deal.

There's some real serious problems, very serious problems.

In many cases, in very few cases do you have a situation where you have a limited number of stakeholders overlying the groundwater basin. In most cases even no matter how badly overdrawn these basins are, if you start doing something as per the Butte basin where they ran into all sorts of problems, including lawsuits, you find out you've all of a sudden got hundreds, maybe thousands of people overlying the basins that there affected in different ways by however you want to operate that basin, and this is something that needs to be solved and looked into and checked for feasibility. As I say, I think conjunctive use of groundwater is a very important element of water supply in California but, we must be realistic and try to see if we can solve these problems of how to really

The matter of upstream storage, I like this

PORTALE & ASSOCIATES DEPOSITION REPORTERS

Page 173 - Page 176

Page 180

Page 177

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2

3

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

E -0 1 3 3 1 4

idea. I think upstream is the only real positive method of increasing the water supply. As a person from -- I might 2 3 introduce myself, because I'm the Director of the Calaveras 4 County Water District.

Of course, I'm very interested in mountain counties problems, and we need water and, unfortunately, especially if you go over 2,000 foot elevation we don't have any alternatives. We have no groundwater basins up there. And our hills are so steep offstream storage is rarely available. We're restricted to instream storage.

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And we need these because if you look at the roles of ownership in our areas, half of the people, at least half of the owners, are people of the urban areas, Los Angeles, the San Francisco Bay Area. We had one tract 244 lot holders, 42 percent were from the Bay area, the owners of these parcels. They are all going to move up there and want water and we've got to supply them. Where are we going to get it?

We can't get it from the groundwater.

We can't get it only from developing instream sources and putting in reservoirs. If we build a reservoir up there, we've got to plan for 20 years of supply. You can't put a reservoir in every year and keep building and enlarging it. You put in a reservoir for a 20 year supply but in the first five years you don't use any of it. You

down in the south Delta there. Water supply to eliminate

2 reverse flows, these are all needs that could well be met

3 far beyond the needs of the pumping plants that transfer

4 water further south.

> And I'm especially interested -- and this has been one thing that's come up here -- is the matter of the BDAC assurance work group and I'm very fascinated by that.

This is the first time I've heard of it, and I hope that this goes ahead and moves and I will certainly be participating in it because we have a great concern about

We are worried about assurance of counties of origin. Are we going to be satisfied or assured that we are going to have water when we need it and how are we going to do it? How are we going to ensure this?

We've been talking for decades about trying to get a Constitutional amendment to try to assure water awards and rights, never could get it through the legislature. Maybe if we put it as part of a package that came through this CalFed process maybe we could get it into a Constitutional amendment but I'm very much concerned about that, that we should be able to assure the long-term benefits to the counties of origin.

And my concern, also, as far as assurances are concerned is earlier developments versus long range

Page 178

use maybe five or ten percent of the capacity and the rest of the water us just goes downstream and furthermore you've got level payments on these things so that your cost of water is actually prohibitive in the first few years.

What we need is some help in here and say if we build upstream storage, let's say we build 20,000 acre feet of storage, let's say that all of the excess capacity or capability of that yield in that system could be accredited and compensated for by the Bay Delta is upstream storage.

So that I'm saying here we could have a fairly sizable contribution to upstream storage from little reservoirs up and along the mountain areas that are serving the mountain people. And then you could move ahead with the larger reservoirs, which, of course, would be the most economical but we need to be considered in this whole program of upstream storage.

One of the questions I raise talking about the limit -- upper limit of the isolated facility, 15,000 second feet because they say that's the capacity of the State and Federal water transportation facilities, but there is other needs for water from an isolated facility western, San Joaquin County desperately needs water. They would certainly be willing to take out of the south Delta.

Even Alex would love to see some good water

1 developments.

> We might have a lot of support in the things that are built in the next five years. What's going to happen to those things, more specifically, reservoirs, storage facilities, things like that, that take a longer time to put on line.

The very people that are supporting this program will heartily support the things in the first few years, mostly of which are environmental and then opposing or not support and maybe even take to court to oppose these later facilities.

How do you ensure that these later facilities are going to be implemented to make this equation work out? Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN MADIGAN: Thank you, sir. Yes,

sir.

BILL Du BOIS: I'm Bill Du Bois with the California Farm Bureau.

19 The reason that I'm before you is only that in 20 the meeting summary of June 28th on page 7 it refers to my 21 comments on the San Joaquin Valley drainage program and it 22 uses the word that I consider it a promising solution to

23 the problem, and I think there must be some confusion

24 between -- I know there is some confusion between what I 25 think and what this reports.

Page 177 - Page 180

```
Page 181
            I'm not sure whether I actually said something
 1
 2
    like this. If I did, I'm horrified.
 3
            But I certainly -- I do think there is one
 4
    aspect of that --
 5
                CHAIRMAN MADIGAN: You are in some good
 6
    company.
 7
                MR. BROWN: -- drainage report that is
 8
    promising and that is that it says that some day they are
9
    going to have to do something about getting rid of the
10
    salt. That's the only thing in it that's promising and I
11
    just wanted to straighten that out because I don't want
12
    anybody to think that I considered that that report using a
13
     system of confining waste on the individuals farms is
14
    anywhere close to a solution to the salt removal problem in
15
    the San Joaquin Valley or anywhere else in California.
16
             Thank you.
17
                CHAIRMAN MADIGAN: Thank you.
18
            Now (indicating).
19
```

ARNOLD RUMMELSBURG: My name is Arnold Rummelsburg representing Wheeler Ridge Maricopa Water Storage District where a member unit of the Kern County Water Agency contract for about 250,000 acre feet of entitlement, the largest agricultural contractor then in the State Water Project.

I wanted to comment on item number two, a

Page 183 system in North America. Now, what does that really mean 2 and what's the significance to what we are doing here?

3 Well, the significance, it seems to me, is that 4 we've got to make sure that these things that we are 5 talking about for ecosystem, and I'll use the word 6 improvement, are going to work. So I think it's important 7 that there be a great deal of attention to that very thing, 8 and if we do these various things that are being talked 9 about and change some of the flows and do some of these 10 things, are they really going to accomplish what we are 11 talking about or are we just throwing more water away?

It makes the statement in here that perhaps the greatest economic impact may be derived from the de-establishment of the estuary's biota, due to the introduction and establishment of an average of one new species every 24 weeks

This phenomenal rate of species addition has contributed to the failure of water users and regulatory agencies to manage the estuary so as to sustain healthy populations of anagamous and native fish.

Lester, I'm not sure. You probably have this report. I think it would be well for at least the Executive Summary of it to be made available to all of the members of BDAC and we need to make sure that certainly as water users we are in support of improving the environment,

Page 182

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

5

6

7

8

9

10

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

portion of it there, the ecosystem restoration.

20

21 22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

I've heard a lot of about ecosystem restoration and in one of the earlier sessions I think I raised a question of what is it or at least we had it in our letter. We didn't understand restored to what, where are we going?

Just a day or two ago I received a document, a biological study, a case study of the biological invasion

of the San Francisco Bay and Delta.

And I thought this was most interesting because even though I haven't been around as long as Bill Dunn I do remember when the Delta pool concept was what we were all 11 talking about and we put together the State Water Project. We thought we had water rights. We thought we had a certain yield. Every time the Board would meet, make some new decisions we'd lose some water.

15 16 It seems that every time there is a problem in 17 the Delta a lot of people think that you can solve it by 18 throwing water at it and we wondered whether that was the 19 case and I've heard very little through all of the 20 activities of CalFed and BDOC, although I'm sure it has 21 been discussed some, of this business of introduced species

22 in the Bay Delta estuary. 23 This report recently has a date of December, 24 1995, makes the statement that the San Francisco estuary 25 can be recognized as the most invaded aquatic estuary

Page 184 the habitat and all of that, but we don't want to be

2 throwing more water away and have it not do any good. So I

3 commend this to you and I'd like to hear from your people 4 later on just how this can be tied into the entire system.

CHAIRMAN MADIGAN: Thank you, sir.

All right. Let's give it a go. See what our notes look like and see if we have something that approximates again consensus on the thoughts of this group regarding the question.

SCOTT MCCREARY: We had relatively less discussion on the common programs and on staging compared to the ideas that we discussed this morning but still we think there are some conclusions that can be pulled out.

Common programs are a practical idea and a helpful structure. That seemed to be the sense of the group.

The common programs help bring a focus on the need to make expenditures in these four program areas that otherwise perhaps would get less attention. There are some concerns expressed about whether common programs will be extensive enough.

I mean, remember, the whole premise of the common programs was the critique of the earlier alternatives that some of them just didn't go far enough in these four program areas. We are still hearing some

PORTALE & ASSOCIATES DEPOSITION REPORTERS

Page 181 - Page 184

	THE MILLETTICE	JII 0 0	3021 17, 177
	Page 185		Page 18
1	residual concerns about that.	1	feedback here in the last several weeks from particularly
2	There was also a question about the need to	2	business groups in Southern California that kind of
3	clarify how implementation of an alternative could affect	3	parallel what Bob was saying so far as Southern California,
4	implementation of the common programs. In other words,	4	and I suppose I would have to and I said I would feed
5	would we really have parity across all four common programs	5	this into the system that the general view is perhaps
6	with the different alternatives?	6	there has not been enough of an outreach to 16, 18 million
7	There were some concerns specific to the	7	people in Southern California. So I hope you will take
8	different program areas.	8	that into consideration here as we move ahead.
9	On ecosystem restoration we heard some concerns	9	CHAIRMAN MADIGAN: That's the reason for
10	about whether the details for the central Delta were	10	the question.
11	specific enough. We heard a lot of different concerns	11	All right. Thank you. Roberta.
12	about water use efficiency on various sides, about whether	12	MS. BORGONOVO: I would just reiterate
13	we were pressing hard enough, about whether demand	13	that we talked yesterday, I think Tom had brought it up in
14	management was getting enough attention and about whether	14	the finance group, about holding meetings in Southern
15	there were inappropriate impacts, especially on the	15	California.
16	agricultural community.	16	But you might also consider holding a meeting
17	So that seemed to be the gist of the comments	17	in the Bay Area, perhaps down further in the Valley, just
18	on the Common Program, again, overall, the sense of the	18	because everything those meetings with the whole CalFed
19	group seemed to be that common programs are a good idea and	19	team here is slightly is a different way of allowing
20	a helpful structure and a superior policy choice to the way	20	people to have input than coming up to Sacramento.
21	they were handled before.	21	CHAIRMAN MADIGAN: You can just never
22	CHAIRMAN MADIGAN: Thoughts.	22	really have too much public input in a project like this.
23	Questions? Comments?	23	Yeah.
24	Okay?	24	I mean, that's really almost where it gets.
25	Okay. All right.	25	All right. Who else?
	Page 186		Page 18
1	Let's go on to question four then and we may	1	David.
2	be	2	MR. GUY: I think one suggestion, Lester.
3	SCOTT McCREARY: Mr. Chair, I'm sorry,	3	I think there has been some concern from
ا ا		1 .	

5

6

7

8

9

11

13

18

19

21

22

23

24

25

E -0 1 3 3 1 6

there was also a summary on question three. 5 Do you want to do that briefly? 6 CHAIRMAN MADIGAN: Well, sure we do. 7 SCOTT McCREARY: All right. Staging of 8 common programs, again, the idea that this is a practical approach, the idea that we should try and move forward with 10 all four components so that no one of them gets ahead of 10 11 the others and clarify how CalFed, which is essentially a 12 planning group, can really sponsor implementation and that 12 13 seemed to be the sense of the group on this one. 14 CHAIRMAN MADIGAN: Yeah. CalFed or 15 something like CalFed, I guess, supplementing agency, 16 anyway, okay. 17 All right. Let's go on to question four. 18 The question is the level of public involvement 19 and outreach, has it been adequate? 20 20 MR. FOLEY: Yes. 21 CHAIRMAN MADIGAN: Tom. 22 MR. MADDOCK: Earlier Bob Raab mentioned

mountain counties, I know, from the outset of the project and I would urge you to take that into consideration in Phase II, to try to get out into the mountain counties. CHAIRMAN MADIGAN: Sunne. MS. MCPEAK: You could going to respond to mountain county district?

(Inaudible)

MS. MCPEAK: Well, what we have done so far, except for the geographic locations is to have lots of Workshops and invited anyone who wanted to come and that's

14 been an extra ordinary effort, but looking at what Bob Raab 15 earlier talked about, maybe people not knowing because 16 while it's been an impressive number of people who have 17 responded to the invitations to attend Workshops we have

not taken the entire State and said where are all of the stakeholders and can we do an outreach?

Can we systematically figure out all of the interests that are there and invite them in. So if you're really going to do that, you'd take a look at community groups, governmental agencies. I know that we have a contract with the local Government institute that's

reaching out to city and county officials, but business and

Page 185 - Page 188

as part of the initial discussion some concern that groups

in the Bay Area had -- that perhaps they don't understand

the program and I might say that I have had a lot of

23

24

Page 189 labor and perhaps other community based organizations, but really invite them in to some six, if you will, round 3 tables almost within California that have -- they are open 4 meetings. Anyone can attend, but really ask them to come in. So if you are going to -- if you want to take this to the ultimate, that would be the next sort of format and 6 7 posture we would want to pursue. 8 CHAIRMAN MADIGAN: Ann. 9 MS. NOTTHOFF: I see that we have a pretty 10 long list here of presentations that CalFed staff has made 10 11 to stakeholder groups and I think that's another way of 11 12 identifying groups that have not participated as 12 13 extensively in the Public Workshop process that, in fact, 13 14 should be hearing more about where we are now that we've 14 15 got a smaller range of alternatives. It's a little more 15 16 digestible at this point and I'm really going out and doing 16 17 some presentations to those groups and being pro-active 17 18 about it rather than asking them to come to a 18 19 hearing -- coming to the hearing. 19 20 I think this might be a good thing to do in 20 21 this next phase. 21 22 22 CHAIRMAN MADIGAN: All right. 23 Members of the audience? 23 24 (No response) 24

Page 191

up there, spent all my life there, and we used to go up in 2 the Elk Grove forest in the 1920's and 1930's and you could 3 drink the water.

There was lots of little clean babbling brooks and there was no problem with drinking the water.

That's not true anymore, and I think it has something to do with the carbon cycle. I think that when you talk about water quality, it starts in the Sierra.

And now as far as land retirement and agriculture, we view things just a little bit differently as organic farmers maybe than what we term conventional agriculture or industrialized agriculture, and industrialized agriculture has gotten into where marketing orders are -- affect just all kind of crops.

I am not sure just what all they are, but a lot of just -- I know in the case of kiwis, we do grow kiwis and they are subject to a marketing order, and about half of those kiwis are not marketable through the normal channels, but yet it's very good food, and I think this is true of oranges and lemons and probably apples and pears. I don't know how many things marketing orders are pertinent to, and they are rejected in a lot of cases for minor blemishes under these marketing orders, is this good food, and as a result people -- this might be an insect bite or might even be a worm or something, but this tends -- people

I guess the notion here really is we've done quite a bit. There is quite a bit more to be done. We need to get even a little more creative in terms of how we've outreached to reach all of the various interest

groups and subsets of interest groups around the State that

6 sort of -- you do absolutely as much as you can do 7 and -- yes, sir?

What have we got?

25

1

3

4

8

10

11

13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

RICHARD HARTER: My name is Richard Harter and I'm a retired organic farmer and as such I kind of feel like the tail that's trying to wag the dog, but I hear you talk about ecosystem efficiency and I can think in terms of 12 beavers.

My farming operation -- I think beavers have played a part in the development of our renewable resources that far exceeds anything the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers have done.

I hear talk about new storage and this type of thing. It just sounds like this is just a continuation of what we've been -- we've gone through this phase of dam building whether the U. S. Army Corps of Engineers have done it, but they basically destroyed our -- so much with the activities of agriculture and logging and a lot of things that have been our renewable resources have been on a decline.

Page 190

25

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

4

5

6

7

8

9

to get more fruit into marketing channels and they've got

2 to deal with the insects or whatever, the disease, which a

lot of times they are pretty minor blemishes. As organic 3

farmers we don't use those chemicals. We find that there

is natural balances that work and as such we -- I don't think we're affecting -- I think this heavy chemical use in 6

7 our agricultural lands, I don't think it's doing our soil

8 quality -- I think we are losing top soil. I think there

is a carbon cycle not only up in the Sierra and in the

soils of the Sierra that is a very fragile thing. It's 10

11 closely tied to the hydrological cycle and you get these

12 carbon -- and it has to do with living organisms, with the 13 fungi and the microscopic organisms and things in the soil

14 that seems like organic farmers understand some of those

15 things and air is just as important in the soil, oxygen, as 16

water is, and you upset some of these very delicate relationships among these micro-flora in the soil and you

no longer have a healthy soil.

Nature tends to be a purifying process from everything that I have observed where by the time we get done with it, doing our -- what we consider good economic practices and so forth, it is no longer a healthy situation, and I think this is pretty much true of our agricultural lands, and I think that affects water quality and also quantity.

PORTALE & ASSOCIATES DEPOSITION REPORTERS

I was born in the Sacramento Valley and I grew

Page 189 - Page 192

Page 192

Page 193 Page 195 1 CHAIRMAN MADIGAN: Thank you, sir. has not been addressed, but I wanted to focus on it. I 2 RICHARD HARTER: Thank you. 2 think that with all the talk of SB 900, the tremendous 3 CHAIRMAN MADIGAN: Anything else under the 3 advantages it has for leveraging for ecosystem restoration 4 general heading of public involvement and outreach that 4 that there is a tendency to think that that sort of takes 5 needs to be said? 5 care of ecosystem restoration and I think that we talked in 6 Mr. Petry? 6 the finance work group and that will probably come up under 7 MR. PETRY: I'll be as brief as I can, 7 Eric's report about the need for this ongoing 8 Mike. It would take less time than splitting a six pack 8 implementation of ecosystem elements, of the need for 9 with you. 9 having some kind of a user fee that's very broad based, 10 How about splitting a bowl of cowboy stew with 10 that would emphasize that ecosystem restoration affects 11 me? 11 water quality, water reliability and also has seismic 12 That will make you leave home, stay gone and 12 considerations, but I think that this whole effort to 13 never come back. 13 integrate these different themes that are going through the 14 CHAIRMAN MADIGAN: I'll check on the 14 work group is very important to the public at large. I 15 recipe before I eat it. 15 think that what comes out of the finance work group can 16 MR. PETRY: Anyhow, what I'd like to see 16 influence the water efficiency group, it can influence the 17 when you're talking about going to the Los Angeles area and 17 whole ecosystem restoration and so that remains a concern 18 doing some studying down there, what I'd like to see some 18 of mine of how we begin to integrate the work of those very 19 of the Council members come to the 96340 area and I could 19 important groups. 20 give them a short tour over there and it might be of some 20 MS. MCPEAK: Roberta, on the question of 21 benefit and make them better understand the conditions that 21 user fees, which was also part of the initial discussions 22 we have there. If there are some members of the Council 22 in the SB 900 negotiations, is there a preference that you 23 that would like to come to Mendota I'd be more glad to give 23 and others have as to who pays the user fee? 24 24 them a tour of the area. Let me elaborate. 25 25 It can be done through revenue bonds as a CHAIRMAN MADIGAN: Thank you. Page 194 Page 196 financing mechanism, which is not a funding mechanism. 1 MR. PETRY: Thank you. 1 2 2 CHAIRMAN MADIGAN: All right. Ultimately the users have to pay to generate 3 Summary? 3 the revenue stream to pay revenue bonds so in that case you 4 What have we got? would probably have user fees at the point of the user as 5 5 SCOTT McCREARY: The question is is the opposed to a district or user fees going directly to the 6 level of public involvement adequate? 6 State. 7 7 And I think the answer is probably a qualified Is there something in this dialogue that I'm 8 yes, but there were a number of suggestions for specific 8 not aware of that would help me understand the term user 9 9 groups and geographic areas that might be under fee and is that something you expect the State to collect 10 represented, and I think if we kept going we'd probably 10 at the State level or could it be at a local water district have the whole State here. We've got Southern California, 11 11 level or all of the above and that's still open for 12 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

the Bay Area, mountain counties, business and labor and with the public comment, Mendota to round out the list. There was also a question to somehow assess the number of groups or the groups that have a stake in Bay Delta issues, compare that with the people that actually come to Workshops or have gotten briefings and devise other methods of outreach. So that seems to be the advice from the BDAC.

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

CHAIRMAN MADIGAN: Thoughts, anybody? 20 Okay. Are there any other issues under sort of 21 22 a larger question number five that anybody here on the BDAC would like to see addressed? 23 Roberta. 24

24 25 MS. BORGONOVO: This isn't an issue that negotiation -- for discussion?

MS. BORGONOVO: I think that's open and I think that it is a very sensitive issue. Gary Bobker is still here, I believe, and he was one of the chief negotiators in SB 900, but the concept of user fee was one of the things that the environmental community dropped because they knew that it was sensitive but I just wanted to reiterate that it's still something that we think is important. There have been a number of creative suggestions talked about. There have been suggestions in forums before like SB 1630 -- I mean, the draft 1630 plan --MS. MCPEAK: Right.

25

MS. BORGONOVO: -- about assessing some

Page 197 sort of fee. I just will give you my own personal 2 preference, not for any other organization. 3 I think that if it's really broader based so 4 that it includes everybody who benefits out of the of the 5 watershed, that that's a real help. And I don't know what 6 plan it will take. But, certainly, I think that these are 7 the kinds of issues that maybe you want to begin sending 8 out to the different groups and having them give feedback. 9 We are just beginning to address it in our 10 finance work group but in the discussions of SB 900 I 11 was -- both Sunne and I and Steve Hall were down south when 12 the discussion of SB 900 came up, and I think that it's 13 important to be honest when people talk to you about 14 SB 900, what it does do and what it doesn't do. It has 15 tremendous potential and one of the most -- one of its 16 greatest advantages was the way in which the three groups 17 really tried to work together so that they could see that 18 all of their needs were more or less protected, and I 19 certainly would hope that that would be the way that you 20 would address a user fee. 21 CHAIRMAN MADIGAN: All right, 22 Thank you all very much -- whoa, I'm sorry, 23 Roger. 24 MR. STRELOW: On policy issues, one thing 25 that it would be very helpful to see sometime before too

Page 199 demands and projections of demands and supplies.

2 But we have not adopted as a goal of the Bay 3 Delta program that all of the State's future water supplies 4 will be met out of the of the Bay Delta system.

5 MR. STRELOW: I understand that, and I 6 didn't mean to imply otherwise but if we are currently, 7 what, about two-thirds, something like that, I mean, we are 8 a big factor, and so if what we are doing coupled with 9 other activities --

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SNOW: Right. MR. STRELOW: -- and I guess they would certainly have to be included in that, if the whole package is somehow out of line, we ought to at least know that or if we are in line, which I'd like to assume we are, it would be comforting to know that.

> CHAIRMAN MADIGAN: All right. Thank you. Lester.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SNOW: Okay. I want to take just literally three minutes to cover an issue that has been of some interest during our discussion today to just remind you of the kind of the three parallel paths as we move into Phase II.

One is the area that we've tended to focus on and that is the NEPA/CEQA process, the documentation to produce an EIR and an EIS in this process so we kind of

Page 198

call that the alternative evaluation kind of legal analysis.

Also, and this has been an important issue to many of you, we will be continuing the component refinement process to refine what we mean by water use efficiency, refine the ecosystem program, all of those components that we've had.

The other track has specifically come up today, and that's the implementation strategy, which has two basic components to it.

One is the financial strategy, what are the financial alternatives we need to look at in order to be able to say we know we can finance the preferred alternative, and the other component of that is the assurances and institutional guarantees.

And so those things all have to come along in parallel so when we get to the end of Phase II we not only have a preferred alternative that we are all comfortable with and is legally defensible, we have refined the components so it's easier to move into implementation. We have a financing strategy and we have a proposal on how to provide the assurances and institutional structures to move forward.

Now, to make sure that we have the proper kinds of input, we have defined, and you've seen this in another

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 long would be to really get us more of a perspective, I 2 think, than least than I have on the supply side. I don't mean that to the exclusion of other issues, but here we are 3 4 in a State where we are clearly constantly bumping up against the limits of supply and we are growing. We are 5 6 probably going to grow faster in the near future than we 7 have in the last couple of years. We are very 8 appropriately taking an effort here to give much more 9 attention to the environment that has been slighted in the 10 past as we attempt to provide adequate supply but one thing 11 I don't have really the faintest sense of at this point is 12 how the measures -- the kinds of measures we are talking 13 about, including conservation, is an important element, but 14 including some additional storage and conveyance capacity, 15 coupled with, you know, devoting more water to environmental purposes, how does that all relate to 16 17 reasonable projections of the demands that we are likely to be facing five, ten, twenty years from now and are we 18 19 pretty much in phase with that or not? 20 I think it would be very instructive if we

could get some kind of briefing or information even sent

out that would kind of put us in perspective there. At

can provide an overview of the State's water resource

least more than I have. Maybe others have that.

21

22

23

24

PORTALE & ASSOCIATES DEPOSITION REPORTERS

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SNOW: I think that we

Page 197 - Page 200

Page 200

After the Public Workshop we take the issue and

Page 201 form before, of a very basic component refinement process, 2 where a product is generated by CalFed Agency staff in 3 collaboration particularly with the work groups.

4 That gets put into a forum where we will hold a 5 Public Workshop.

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

comments to BDAC and combine the BDAC comments with the other material and discuss with CalFed, clearly a feedback group. We may not get it right the first time. So conceptionally you can think of a draft ecosystem restoration program developed again in collaboration with a work group that's turned into a Workshop draft.

We hold a Workshop on it. We take the comments, make modifications, talk to BDAC about it and hopefully through CalFed end up with some final draft component.

The same thing would happen with a finance strategy, with the assurances strategy, so this is the basic structure that we intend to use to make sure that the public has input and BDAC has exposure as we refine these components.

22 That will be going on throughout Phase II. 23 CHAIRMAN MADIGAN: Questions? Anybody. 24 Thank you, Lester.

25 Let's go on to the work groups then and see how

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Page 203

Page 204

funding for programs that are within our CalFed solution. 2 And then there is also the prospect of new 3 funding at some point.

4 With the long lead times that are involved in 5 that, though, it looks like that is something that we would have to start fairly soon if we are able to count on it 6 7 later when we need it.

Secondly, we reviewed the paper on financing options that was presented by the California round-table, the Manufacturers Association, State Chamber of Commerce and Farm Bureau and everybody here, I think, got copies of that.

We were interested in a variety of their recommendations, one of which was, of course, user fees which has been discussed here today. But we are using that as sort of a background. That's sort of a tool kit for doing the job that we really have to do. It doesn't tell us how to build anything and doesn't tell us how to really use each of those in the most effective way to finance the kinds of programs that we see coming out of this process.

Yesterday we had our first review of a case study that I think I reported to you last time we had decided as our way of proceeding as a finance working group rather than keep going round and round the loop talking about different ways of doing it, the way we felt we could

Page 202

things are going.

Eric? MR. HASSELTINE: The finance committee is

alive and well and has met in both June and July since we last met as a committee here. We were following SB 900, of course, but not

only for the general interest that we all had in it but also to be able to get more quantifiable information relative to the amount of money that might be available for certain of these -- for these actions.

12 gentleman named Rich Atwater to attend our last meeting 13 who, I can't give you exactly his title or who he works 14 for, but he's heavily involved in lobbying back in 15 Washington on the Federal matching funds and Federal monies 16 that would compliment the State monies.

And then as an adjunct to that we also asked a

17 CHAIRMAN MADIGAN: Jack, who did Rich go

18 to work for? 19 (Inaudible)

20 CHAIRMAN MADIGAN: And so he was at our

21 meeting yesterday and filled us in there. 22 The interesting part to that is there are

23 really two aspects to the Federal funding. One is that 24 there are existing Federal programs for which monies may qualify and become available for matching funds or other

learn the most and perhaps accomplish the most would be to

2 actually take a case study and try to work it through and

try to come to some conclusions as to how well we knew the 3 cost, how those costs would be allocated amongst various 4

5 parties benefiting from the overall program, and then how

each of those parties might, in fact, be able to finance 6 and meet the responsibilities that we would like to place 7 8 upon them.

We are just starting that now.

The alternative that was chosen was the dual conveyance, which was alternative C back when we had the ten alternatives.

That has now in effect moved into alternative three on the three that we have now, although alternative three contains some things that alternative C didn't, and so we are going to adjust -- I guess, Zach's going to adjust that, so that it's more closely correlated with alternative three, but yesterday we reviewed some preliminary just cost figures in terms of capital costs and operating expenses associated with the system once it's in place.

What the overall cash flow requirements might be in terms of a debt service on the bonds and how much we thought would be available for the public part of this, which was primarily the ecosystem restoration.

PORTALE & ASSOCIATES DEPOSITION REPORTERS

Page 201 - Page 204

Page 205 1 And since -- in general I think we just looked at those in terms of orders of magnitude so there is 2 nothing really specific available but we are just beginning 3 4 to get our feet wet now on really how to assign these costs and no -- I think the numbers that were presented 6 yesterday, what they told us, is that we have 80 percent 7 confidence that they're within 35 percent of the real 8 number. So we are not too precise yet. 9 Anyway, but we are working at it. 10 But we do have some basic things. 11 Zach, do you have some overheads? 12 MR. MCREYNOLDS: Yeah. 13 Do you want me to run through them? 14 MR. HASSELTINE: Yeah, do you want to talk 15 about that? 16 Good. I'll turn this over to Zach McReynolds who is our staff member working on the finance. 17 18

MR. MCREYNOLDS: And the figure that you

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

15

16

17

18

19

21

forgot to include with that, 80 percent, 35 percent was the credibility of the person who said that, which is -- those are the percentages that you can multiply that by.

We are going to use this kind of an example that we started with yesterday to step through a number of basic questions about the plan of finance in the next few months and as we go in the next few months within the

1 We want to have the group as a whole. We won't 2 have every I dotted and every T crossed but the group as a 3 whole needs to be comfortable that we figured out how this 4 solution will be implemented from a financial prospective.

5 CHAIRMAN MADIGAN: Thank you, Eric. 6

**Questions?** 

7 Mary.

9

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

4

7

8

9

10

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

8 Questions?

(No response)

10 CHAIRMAN MADIGAN: Mary, you are up. 11

MS. SELKIRK: Yes.

The ecosystem restoration work group met on June 26th. We have another meeting scheduled for the middle of next week.

The central items discussed at our prior meeting were four. First, a review of the aspects of the proposed ecosystem outline, the restoration program strategy that's been developed by the CalFed staff.

I would say by and large that there has been general consensus on the vision mission ecosystem quality objectives and program strategy sections of the plan with some concern expressed by some members of the work group with regard to -- germane to our earlier discussions today how we define the benefit of agricultural activities in the Delta, that there needs to be some language in the overall

Page 206

working group and as the working group reports its findings and things back to the larger BDAC you should expect to be answering these questions with increasing clarity.

The first sets of answers will -- you're all used to this -- the first sets of answers will be more general and then as we move through this we'll get more and more specific about what we are talking about.

But the general six topics we are going to run through are who will be paying for the solution? What types of costs are we talking about? When will the payments be made? How will the payments be made in other 11 words, what types of revenue tools will we use.

13 How are the costs going to be allocated among 14 the people who will pay?

And then what's the implementation structure going to be?

And that question was discussed a lot earlier in terms of assurances and things like that.

The general sense being that if we as a group 20 can understand the answers to these six questions at a sufficient level of detail, then we will have a general 22 confidence that there is a workable plan of finance behind 23 the solution.

24 And by the time we get through with Phase II 25 that's where we want to be.

Page 208

ecosystem restoration strategy that reflects environmental benefits of certain types of agricultural activities in the 3 Delta.

The major portion of the discussion at the prior meeting which will continue next week is that we are now at a point where the CalFed staff is seeking input on how to quantify the ecosystem vision.

There was a discussion, a lively discussion, of three proposed approaches to how you define a healthy ecosystem.

I don't want to go into a whole lot of detail.

But basically, there were three proposals, one for setting a level of health at some quote unquote pre-disturbance condition.

The second was a more adaptive management based reference condition approach, which would involve setting what one fishery biologist called diagnostic goals and prescriptive actions, which would support restoration using adaptive management techniques.

The third is to set a level of restoration at some period in recent Delta history.

There were some comments at this meeting suggesting that it would -- it might be helpful for us to look specifically at what has happened in the last third of the century that has caused the decline, major decline of

PORTALE & ASSOCIATES DEPOSITION REPORTERS

Page 205 - Page 208

fisheries since 1960 or so.

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

11

12

13

14

15

16 17

18

21

2 And then the fourth area of discussion was just 3 along with adaptive management was the beginning of a 4 conversation about what kinds of programmatic structures 5 are necessary for -- to underpin the restoration program.

I have to say, however, I think that at this point in time we are -- I'm sure Bob Raab would agree -- in what I would call the groan zone as far as just an enormous amount of important opinions, different perspectives, different ideas about how -- what's the most effective and supportable ecosystem restoration program, not to say that by any stretch that administrative and institutional guarantees are premature but I think we are getting to a point -- I don't think we are there yet -- but I think through -- in the beginning stages of Phase II we will be beginning to have discussion of what kinds of programmatic structures are required to implement a particular kind of

The CalFed staff has continued to refine a set of fairly discreet actions for all areas of the watershed in the Delta that Dick identified earlier, and they continue to take input from this work group. Now, the work group itself is composed of about five people from the BDAC and invited participants.

adaptive management strategy and I think that will be on

our Agenda over the next few months.

Page 209

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

environmental and community groups. Dues are voluntary and 1 2 the discussion centered around the strengths and weaknesses of this approach in encouraging water conservation. 4

The weaknesses that were identified were that, in fact, although there is enthusiasm in many urban areas for conservation programs it can change when the weather changes and the compliance with BMP's is spotty. It was also pointed out that the group really -- because it's a group primarily of water agencies it's difficult for them to do a good evaluation of compliance or regulation of themselves, self-regulation, self-evaluation was admitted in a forthright way as not fully effective using this approach.

The strengths of the approach were that the collaboration between urban water districts and environmental community groups had been very, very strong. In fact, it was reported that the best implementation took place when community groups were sort of in the driver's seat running the conservation programs in their communities. So this collaboration between community groups and the water districts was seen as very, very healthy. The Urban Water Conservation Council was also reported as doing an lot of very useful research into best management practices and being able and capable of updating those BMP's to reflect advances in technology, et cetera.

Page 210

There is also a lot of very active involvement from members of the public, some of whom of very strong opinions and different perspectives on the whole ecosystem approach, all of which we've made a very strong effort to incorporate into our deliberations so . . .

CHAIRMAN MADIGAN: Thank you.

7 Questions? 8 (No response) 9 Thanks, Mary. 10 Judith.

> MS. REDMOND: Okay. Our group met on June 27th and there was a lot of preliminary discussion that is covered in the notes and has also come up today regarding sort of the purview of our group, whether, you know, the issue of land retirement and other issues, whether or not they should be included in the discussion, and I think since that's been -- it's really come up a lot today already. I'm not going to go into it right now.

19 But the bulk of our discussion was focused on 20 best management practices in urban areas and we started with a presentation about the Urban Water Conservation 22 Council.

23 The Urban Water Conservation Council runs a voluntary program that is meant to support implementation 24 of urban BMP's and members are urban water agencies and

Page 212

So that there is sort of a flexible framework within which they work for implementation of the BMP's.

And that framework not only can improve as technology improves but also can provide for local differences, and that was considered to be very important.

So a number of recommendations came out of the meeting. I don't think they were -- any of them fully flushed out but there were -- you know, there was some discussion about all of these and I think that there was some agreement on all of them.

First of all, that the Urban Water Conservation Council should continue as a partner in implementation and enforcement of urban BMP's and, in fact, in order to do that it would need more resources.

Secondly, there was a lot of discussion about approach and the recommended approach was that -- although several approaches were suggested, it really seemed that there was agreement that there should be a combination of incentives for these sort of locally flexible conservation programs but combined with regulatory sanctions that would assure some floor level of compliance. The suggestion was that the -- there be a link between whether or not compliance was occurring and some sort of benefit of CalFed. For example, could you have water transfers or

PORTALE & ASSOCIATES DEPOSITION REPORTERS

Page 209 - Page 212

Page 213 Page 215 could you get Federal loans, those kinds of things. out of their local supply not out of the Delta supply. If enforcement of BMP's was not occurring there 2 2 How do you account for water saving efforts in 3 should be some sanctions, was kind of the approach that was 3 a local service area having a relationship to the Agency's 4 discussed. need for water from the Delta? 5 Other ideas were discussed as well, like 5 MS. REDMOND: Well, I don't think we 6 conservation pricing, user fees. The proposal was made, 6 directly talked about that relationship, to be honest. 7 not really discussed, that community groups and 7 MR. PYLE: I'm just bringing that up. 8 environmental groups might need to play a stronger watchdog 8 Maybe you ought to talk about it. 9 role in order to enforce the BMP's, a better landscaping 9 MS. REDMOND: I think -- well, and we were 10 BMP was discussed, and I think one of the useful 10 talking about urban water conservation and I think the idea 11 discussions was that if this kind of a program is going to 11 was that if there is water conservation in an area, at 12 continue it's going to have to have a very strong component 12 least that frees up water for -- it can free up water for 13 of education. 13 other uses or for a specific -- it can make a system more 14 We discussed a lot the fact that these -- the 14 flexible, and I think the other idea that relates to that 15 conservation ethic really relies on people understanding 15 was that there does seem to be agreement among the water 16 the benefits, its benefits, and it was pointed out by a lot 16 agencies that have signed the urban BMP's, that there are 17 of people there who have a lot of experience with this it's 17 significant savings that can be realized from water 18 not just sort of general public education, it's education 18 conservation efforts in urban areas and that that ethic, 19 of the leaders of urban water districts. In fact, it 19 that idea that water is a resource and that we should use 20 seemed like a lot of the small urban water districts might 20 it carefully, seem to be agreed upon by the people that 21 not always understand that there would be benefits to them 21 were presenting for the urban water agencies. 22 from investing in water conservation programs. 22 CHAIRMAN MADIGAN: All right. Thank you. 23 23 Finally, I think that there was a sense that it The fourth of our work groups is the assurances 24 would be important if there was a bond measure before the 24 work group, which is being Chaired by Hap Dunning and Mary public, for example, that there be an assurance to the 25 25 Scoonover are going to be the staff support to it. They Page 214 Page 216 public. We've been talking a lot about assurances but that will have their meeting on the 15th of August in Sacramento 2 2 from ten to noon in room 1142 of the resources building so one form of assurance to the public would be that we were 3 3 you are all on notice of that. trying to capture all possible efficiencies in different 4 Water quality technical issue. 4 areas and that an assurance that any possible efficiencies 5 5 Mr. Snow. in urban areas were being looked at. 6 It was felt that a program to educate the 6 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SNOW: I will be very 7 7 brief and just report that Steve Yaeger has formed several public about them and to assure the public that this was technical sub-work groups to deal with the overall water 8 taking place would be very helpful. 8 9 Our next meeting is Thursday, August 1st, at 9 quality issue including an environmental water quality 10 group, an agricultural water quality group and then nine o'clock. 10 11 CHAIRMAN MADIGAN: Okay. Thank you. Good 11 continuing work with the stakeholders urban quality group 12 job, all. 12 and intends to work through those issues so that we are 13 Questions? Yes, sir? 13 getting all of the water quality issues addressed by 14 14 technical groups and if you have any questions about that, MR. PYLE: Any questions for members of 15 the --15 I'm sure Steve will be glad to answer them. 16 CHAIRMAN MADIGAN: Sure, brief once, of 16 CHAIRMAN MADIGAN: Other key issues that 17 17 you are aware of? I am aware none. course. 18 18 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SNOW: I am aware none. MR. PYLE: Brief, quick questions, as we 19 19 CHAIRMAN MADIGAN: Before we go on to say. 20 Judith, have you discussed the relationship 20 public comment, it's worth observing that I have been 21 21 between a water conservation method taking place by a local informed that today is Jack Foley's birthday.

PORTALE & ASSOCIATES DEPOSITION REPORTERS

district and its relationship to a Delta water savings?

For instance, I know if in my district and my

Agency were to spend a hundred thousand dollars and saved a

thousand acre feet they would assume that they saved that

22

23

24

Page 213 - Page 216

JACK FOLEY: Can I leave for my party now?

CHAIRMAN MADIGAN: Yes, you can. Thank

22

23

24

25

you, Jack.

Happy Birthday.

```
Page 217
                   MR. FOLEY: Thank you.
 1
 2
               He's on his way out.
 3
                   CHAIRMAN MADIGAN: All right. Public
 4
      comments.
 5
               I don't have any other indications up here nor
 6
      does Sunne of people who wish to be heard other than those
 7
      who have already signed up and who have spoken.
 8
               Is there anybody in the audience who wishes to
 9
      be heard?
10
               Seeing no such requests, you guys have been
11
      troopers. This has been a very good day. Thank you so
12
      much. We are adjourned.
13
14
      (Whereupon the BDAC Meeting recessed at four o'clock p.m.)
15
                         ---oOo---
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
                                                                         Page 218
   STATE OF CALIFORNIA
    COUNTY OF SAN JOAQUIN
               I, SUSAN PORTALE, Certified Shorthand
    Reporter of the State of California, do hereby certify:
               That on the 19th day of July, 1996, at
    the hour of 10:06 a.m., I took down in shorthand notes the
    said Bay-Delta Advisory Council Meeting; that I thereafter
    transcribed my shorthand notes of such Bay-Delta Advisory
    Council Meeting by computer-aided transcription, the above
    and foregoing being a full, true and correct transcription
    thereof, and a full, true and correct transcript of all
    proceedings had.
12
13
14
15
             Certified Shorthand Reporter in and for the
17
             County of San Joaquin, State of California
18
19
20
21
           QUALITY COMPUTERIZED TRANSCRIPTION -by-
         PORTALE & ASSOCIATES DEPOSITION REPORTERS
211 East Weber Avenue
Stockton, California 95202
(209 ) 462-3377 *
22
23
24
              SUSAN PORTALE, CSR NO. 4095
```

Page 217 - Page 218

BDAC M		ING			Condense	31£			'92	- again
'92 <sub>[1]</sub> 12	22:21		29th [3] 6:22	16:9	accept [3]	88:17	85:21 105:17	118:14	administers [1]	169:13
	13:3		87:10		88:23 89:8			119:21	administration	
			3 [1] 12:18		acceptable [1]	124-21	120:2 122:5	122:7	127:19	- [-]
1 .	7:8			54.01			134:20 151:22		administrative	
- <b>by</b> [1] 21	18:21		3,000 [2]	54:21	accommodate	[1]	156:22 157:20			
02[1] 12	26:15		65:1		60:13		158:2 162:22	164:4	209:12	169:16
1		4:2	<b>30</b> [1] 110:10		accomplish [8]		202:10 208:18	209:21		
218:6		1.4	<b>33</b> [1] 127:18		118:15 119:5		activating [1]	134:18	admire [1]	116:4
		10.20	35 [8] 37:7	39:8	156:6 170:15	183:10	active [1]		admitted [1]	211:11
		10:20	40:12 42:25	43:8	204:1			210:1	adopted [1]	199:2
		12:23	174:16 205:7	205:19	accomplishme	nt [1]	activities [14]	9:24		
		48:2	ſ	203.13	157:15		20:17 28:3	29:3	adopting [1]	122:6
		90:11	37[1] 39:14		Accord [2]	113:3	118:14 119:14		Adrienne [2]	122:14
126:15 12			4095 [2] 1:20	218:24	113:8	115.5	150:4 163:7	182:20	122:14	
1,000[1]		94:19	<b>42</b> [1] 177:15		according [2]	50.15	190:22 199:9	207:24	advanced [1]	121:1
1-800-A-	·SOIL	[1]	<b>45</b> [2] 169:18	175.8	59:16	59:15	208:2		advances [1]	211:25
115:13			462-3377 [2]	1:25			activity [2]	66:13	advantage [2]	68:5
10 [3] 1:	:14	4:2	218:23	1.23	account [4]	112:2	128:12		136:19	00.5
218:6		.,_			112:3 151:20		adaptive [9]	14:18		1050
10,000 [1]		65:7	<b>48</b> [1] 126:16		accountability	<b>7</b> [1]	51:9 51:14	63:22	advantages [2]	195:3
		03.7	489[1] 172:24		168:11		112:16 208:15		197:16	
100 [1] 13			5,000 [15]	23:13	accredited [1]	178:8	209:3 209:18		adverse [3]	97:19
1142 [1] 23	16:2		23:17 24:12	24:21	accumulated p		add [10] 23:6	24:12	97:20 97:22	
1300 [1] 17	73:4		25:5 25:15	53:4	32:13 45:22	<b>~</b> 1	25:2 91:6	109:24	advertising [1]	130:12
13th [1] 1:	·11		58:18 59:1	59:11	ł	40.25	131:4 136:8	139:24	advice [13]	11:3
		150,10	59:14 60:15	60:19	accuracy [3]	40:25	140:9 175:16	107.4T	36:11 58:10	61:19
		158:12	65:6 65:17		42:7 42:19		added [2]	141.00	68:15 69:25	70:2
1	10:10		<b>60</b> [1] 93:6		accurate [2]	86:24	175:19	141:23	70:17 70:20	73:25
15,000 [11		23:13	7 [6] 8:20	13:16	153:16				135:19 151:9	194:19
23:17 24	4:12	53:24	46:22 56:12	57:3	accurately [1]	43:22	adding [1]	84:14	advisors [1]	6:21
65:7 6:	5:18	68:1	180:20	37.3	achieve [8]	13:24	addition [4]	5:14		
68:2 68	8:7	68:9	B .		26:2 82:14	118:16	51:19 143:19	183:17	advisory [8]	1:4
178:18			<b>70</b> [1] 127:17		120:5 159:2	159:7	additional [24]	13:14	4:8 71:5	86:5
15th [2] 1	13:3	216:1	<b>80</b> [2] 205:6	205:19	161:24		28:24 29:6	36:11	105:13 164:16	218:7
	87:6		800,000[1]	36:7	achieved [2]	139:14	38:22 39:2	39:15	218:8	
		106.00	<b>90</b> [1] 93:6		139:18	137.17	42:16 80:6	92:1	affect [8]	39:24
1630 [2] 19		196:22		70.4			117:11 121:15	141:22	95:3 145:9	145:11
1700 [1] 17	72:23		900 [24] 8:15	72:4	achievement [2	2]	145:16 165:22	168:1	145:12 145:13	185:3
18 [2] 13	30:16	187:6	98:6 98:10	98:12	72:9 89:1			173:16	191:14	
	:14		99:8 107:6	107:12		14:4	174:5 174:9	174:10	affected [2]	152:8
1920's [1]		101.0	126:21 127:2	127:6	acknowledge	21	174:13 198:14		176:17	
		191:2	127:11 130:22		70:19 146:14	•	additions [1]	164:6	affecting [1]	192:6
1930's [1]		191:2	141:25 142:7 195:2 195:22	170:13	acknowledged	[r11	address [21]	5:6	affects [5]	97:15
1960 [1] 20	09:1		193:2 193:22	196:16	145:20	. [-]	33:9 43:8	50:25	97:16 175:14	97:13
1987[1] 12			202:6	197:14	acquiescence		52:12 52:18	60:6	195:10	192.24
1995 [3] 1'		172.5	202.0		58:5	.I.]	73:1 91:10	91:14		
182:24	12:24	175:5	93640 [2]	116:14		04.04	95:11 99:19	101:15	afford [2]	39:24
		4.0	122:20		acquire [2]	94:24	108:17 109:10		111:10	
1996 [3] 1:	:14	4:9	95202 [2]	1:24	95:7			171:20	affordability [	1]
218:5			218:23		acquired [1]	77:3	197:9 197:20	1,1.20	157:7	
19th [3] 4:	:9	114:18	95814[1]	1:12	acquiring [3]	94:18	addressed [14]	26.5	afternoon [2]	86:3
218:5			96340[1]	193:19	146:17 146:18				123:21	
1st [1] 2	14:9		a.m [3] 1:14	4:5	acquisition [1]	146:13		82:18 114:21	ag [17] 28:7	80:6
2,000 [2]		64:17	218:6	т.Ј	acre [8] 24:11	60:17		140:20	90:22 91:9	91:13
177:7					65:16 84:8	94:19	160:8 194:23		95:18 96:25	97:14
I	3:5	13:7	a.m.[1] 4:2		178:6 181:22	214:25	216:13	170.1	102:3 111:9	111:15
	3:4	103:11	abandoned [1]	32:5	1		1	1147	124:6 126:2	131:14
177:22 1	J. <del>T</del> 77∙24	103.11	ability [2]	49:9	acreage [2]	30:18	addresses [1]	114:7	131:21 149:21	
		170.4	144:24		143:17		addressing [5]		again [46]	4:18
20,000 [1]		178:6	able [23] 6:18	6:20	acres [1] 36:7		11:22 143:13	148:4	5:19 6:8	7:11
204[1] 1:			7:9 9:22	16:14	act [7] 45:19	71:5	149:22		12:6 12:20	17:2
<b>209</b> [2] 1:	:25	218:23	16:15 34:6	38:21	97:7 113:2	152:11	adequate [5]	82:13	19:18 19:21	20:1
20th [1] 6:	:3		40:5 63:24	64:8	152:12 152:12		148:15 186:19	194:6	20:8 22:1	22:3
211 [2] 1:		218:22	65:24 87:12	99:13	action [6]	57:24	198:10		23:16 23:18	23:20
			109:12 112:14		57:25 115:13	119:17	adjacent [1]	32:1	23:22 28:21	40:11
21st [2] 6		117:3	179:22 200:13		143:17 169:6		adjourned[1]	217:12	41:21 42:22	50:25
	83:16		203:6 204:6	211:24	actions [37]	12:21	adjunct [3]		51:5 52:4	53:6
244 [1] 1	77:15		above [4]	143:17	13:3 14:24	27:12		63:23	56:22 58:24	58:25
250,000		181:22	173:18 196:11		27:16 27:19	27:22	73:15 202:11		59:12 60:1	64:15
26th [1] 2			absolute[1]	60:2	28:1 28:6	28:15	adjust [4]	14:19	71:22 100:20	
					31:23 47:16	47:21	168:11 204:16		119:10 121:17	
27th[1] 2			absolutely [4]		67:8 82:25	83:25	adjusted [1]	24:2	145:25 150:19	
28th [1] 1	80:20		66:11 155:14	190:6					170:14 174:19	184:8
L			OTATEC DE		<u>.                                    </u>		L			v Dogo 1

BDAC MEETING		CondenseIt <sup>™</sup>		against - Army
185:18 186:8 201:11	100:21 102:9 107:21	91:9 110:15 112:11	analyses [1] 53:16	55:8 58:1 100:12
against [2] 130:2	107:24 108:3 111:1	112:12 140:7 147:4	analysis [22] 13:14	121:25 127:5 133:2
198:5	112:25 113:18 115:6	185:3 200:1 200:14 200:18 204:10 204:11	23:17 24:8 48:8	135:16 152:9 161:3
agencies [28] 2:8	115:16 115:22 116:25 117:8 117:21 144:7	200:18 204:10 204:11 204:13 204:14 204:15	50:21 53:18 54:4	186:9 208:16 210:4 211:3 211:13 211:14
34:20 38:3 38:20	150:2 150:5 150:15	204:18	74:7 74:17 74:22	212:16 212:16 213:3
38:25 41:17 41:24	150:16 190:22 191:10	alternatives [92]	80:14 80:23 85:1 85:11 85:16 110:12	approaches [6] 21:24
52:8 52:8 55:5 62:23 71:7 71:15	191:12 191:12 191:13	12:13 12:22 12:24	137:11 155:7 158:25	23:4 99:5 161:7
93:21 115:19 133:11	agriculture's [1]	13:4 13:6 13:11	159:7 171:15 200:2	208:9 212:17
152:5 160:12 163:6	108:6	13:15 14:1 14:2	analytical[1] 86:9	approaching [2]
165:22 166:3 169:9	ahead [16] 4:7	14:9 14:11 15:4	analyze [5] 19:14	10:20 11:23
183:19 188:23 210:25	15:17 72:12 75:8	15:9 15:19 16:18 16:20 17:10 17:18	59:3 74:8 88:20	appropriate [23]
211:9 215:16 215:21	76:21 102:18 102:20	16:20 17:10 17:18 18:21 18:23 26:1	111:5	5:17 29:15 39:10
agency [20] 2:11	114:1 114:9 125:4 136:6 138:15 178:13	26:4 26:15 26:18	analyzed [4] 47:6	59:5 59:8 68:1
3:11 3:12 3:15 38:6 38:13 51:24	179:9 186:10 187:8	26:24 27:13 27:14	76:19 81:22 154:20	70:21 76:14 78:15 79:9 99:15 99:16
52:4 54:3 54:4	air[4] 99:13 101:11	35:13 36:6 42:24	analyzing [1] 84:15	114:5 137:8 141:18
118:4 135:6 151:22	160:21 192:15	46:11 47:11 47:13	Angeles [2] 177:14	142:3 142:6 144:6
151:25 169:11 169:13	airing [1] 101:6	47:17 50:4 51:16 52:1 52:14 54:5	193:17	145:2 150:18 155:12
181:22 186:15 201:2	<b>akin</b> [1] 38:1	56:19 56:23 57:2	Ann [4] 3:9 151:12	166:17 171:18
214:24	Alex [25] 2:11	57:11 65:21 66:6	153:22 189:8	appropriately [4]
agency's [2] 39:4	25:8 45:5 46:14	66:8 67:5 67:7	announced [1] 161:4	6:12 142:25 167:6
215:3	58:17 61:1 61:24	71:23 72:11 72:23	answer [10] 37:21	198:8
Agenda [2] 6:18	66:23 75:8 79:20	72:25 73:8 73:14	62:6 64:3 91:3	approval [2] 78:17
209:19	79:25 80:4 85:11	74:20 75:17 78:17 78:21 82:22 82:25	110:3 113:10 121:2 136:24 194:7 216:15	168:24
aggressive [2] 39:2	88:18 94:3 96:14	78:21 82:22 82:25 83:18 88:13 88:25		approved [2] 128:16
165:4	97:4 116:18 116:25 139:9 140:12 155:9	89:9 94:18 103:13	answered [1] 64:13	168:24
<b>ago</b> [7] 17:23 51:8 156:13 159:14 173:21	160:15 162:1 178:25	105:7 106:14 106:21	<b>answering</b> [3] 154:17 165:19 206:3	approximates [2]   7:1   184:8
174:15 182:6	Alex's [4] 46:5	107:1 108:1 110:13	1	
agree [16] 42:3	80:21 98:7 103:4	111:25 119:10 119:16	<b>answers</b> [4] 65:4 206:4 206:5 206:20	Aqua[1] 131:21
42:18 69:19 71:3	alive [1] 202:4	120:13 124:5 124:25   125:3 125:4 137:2	anti [2] 90:22 96:2	aquatic [1] 182:25
81:1 88:13 108:2	Alliance [3] 2:15	137:11 137:15 138:7	anti-ag [11] 58:14	aqueduct[1] 53:7
111:3 112:17 118:14	2:22 122:17	142:23 145:8 177:8	96:23 98:19 98:20	aqueducts [1] 60:8
121:22 124:6 136:9	allocate [2] 120:17	184:24 185:6 189:15	101:11 101:17 101:18	aquifer [2] 172:10
139:21 152:5 209:7	120:20	200:12 204:12	108:1 111:4 111:9	172:23
<b>agreeable</b> [2] 6:11 155:23	allocated [3] 25:6	Alvord [3] 122:13	124:7	<b>area</b> [37] 2:5 14:14 20:16 20:19 20:20
	204:4 206:13	122:14 122:15	anti-agriculture [1]	20:16 20:19 20:20 28:4 30:16 30:24
<b>agreed</b> [6] 40:22 57:5 57:8 79:10	allocation [2] 122:1	always [8] 5:14	96:16	38:15 49:24 50:11
130:20 215:20	161:14	7:1 7:2 61:11 96:24 101:18 115:9	anti-agrigulture [1]	50:25 65:8 89:5
agreeing [1] 155:11	allocations [1] 122:6	213:21	95:14	91:11 106:2 106:17
agreement [13] 87:19	allowing [1] 187:19	ambiguity[1] 58:3	anticipate [2] 141:22	107:15 108:11 111:8
95:22 108:19 118:23	<b>allows</b> [1] 44:10	ambitious [4] 85:14	163:13	172:6 172:14 172:15 172:17 173:10 177:14
119:3 128:15 141:24	almost [5] 100:11	85:24 141:20 149:12	anyhow [2] 172:4 193:16	177:15 186:24 187:17
147:6 147:17 152:7	127:16 171:15 187:24	ambitiously [1] 161:24		193:17 193:19 193:24
212:10 212:18 215:15	189:3	amen [1] 171:2	<b>anyway</b> [9] 17:6 65:23 99:3 107:16	194:12 199:23 209:2
agreements [1] 29:4	alone [2] 69:7	amended [1] 151:3	115:20 116:4 135:11	215:3 215:11
agrees [2] 157:22	76:17	amendment [2] 179:17	186:16 205:9	areas [39] 12:8
162:6	along [23] 57:23	179:21	<b>apples</b> [1] 191:20	25:17 27:15 30:14 30:19 33:13 47:1
agricultural [30]	67:3 67:24 78:25 84:5 84:10 85:19	America [1] 183:1	applicability [1]	49:17 49:23 51:16
9:10 28:5 35:3 36:18 76:23 77:25	93:12 97:18 98:5	American [1] 115:9	49:6	58:23 70:14 78:9
90:3 94:10 95:17	100:3 105:12 105:21	among [10] 71:21	applicable [1] 170:13	86:14 96:6 111:7
96:4 96:10 97:17	124:14 132:16 156:25	92:21 122:23 129:16	application[1] 171:13	143:7 148:2 150:1
100:23 101:1 107:22	157:12 160:22 164:20	147:6 147:17 156:23	applied [2] 51:15	150:1 150:12 150:14
108:10 124:3 127:21	168:23 178:12 200:16 209:3	192:17 206:13 215:15	124:18	158:11 161:22 164:13 175:20 177:12 177:13
129:12 137:21 150:4 150:4 163:5 181:23	altered [1] 63:21	amongst [2] 101:3	apply [2] 36:24	178:12 184:18 184:25
185:16 192:7 192:24	alternative [47] 13:19	204:4	49:23	185:8 194:9 209:21
207:24 208:2 216:10	15:11 19:1 19:1	amortize [1] 55:23	<b>applying</b> [1] 157:9	210:20 211:5 214:4
agriculturalists [1]	19:17 19:21 19:24	amount [13] 4:23	appreciate [8] 7:17	214:5 215:18
101:4	19:25 21:9 21:9	5:24 30:24 54:25	101:6 107:19 112:21	argue [1] 90:11
agriculture [43] 77:22	21:23 22:7 23:5	55:1 72:6 100:5 124:15 129:4 154:21	114:10 120:24 131:18 171:21	argument [4] 92:25
90:6 94:6 94:8	23:10 37:10 37:14 37:15 37:18 48:4	159:23 202:9 209:9	appreciated [1] 69:13	93:1 129:21 132:15
94:15 94:22 94:24	50:1 50:6 50:24	amounts [3] 32:14	1	arguments [3] 130:7
95:7 95:9 96:4 97:10 97:19 97:21	51:4 53:1 61:3	90:5 143:17	approach [28] 11:9 12:3 13:2 14:4	130:10 134:22
97:22 99:16 99:21	66:10 66:12 66:15	anagamous [1] 183:20	17:2 34:14 37:22	arise [1] 132:10
100:4 100:13 100:18	73:17 74:21 76:15		38:17 43:25 55:6	<b>Army</b> [2] 190:15
PORTALE & ASSO	CIATES DEPOSIT	ON DEPORTED	<u> </u>	Index Page 2

190.20   191.19   1	BDAC MEET	TING			Co	ondens	eIt™			Arnold -	bonding
200.22   201.18   200.18   200.18   200.18   200.18   200.18   201.18   200.18   201.18   2	190:20		163:21 165:2	165:12	203:16			78:24 79:6	81:15	69:25 74:2	75:14
18119	Arnold [2]	181:19			backtra	ack m	11:7			79:7 79:18	113:10
	181:19			206:18			90:7				
	arrangement [1	.]									
179-52   212-2   2147					1		1 10.10				193:21
	arrangements	[1]					176.12			i .	17.24
	95:21										
	<b>array</b> [1] 75:18										
	arrive [1]	137:17				115.10	124.17		206:2		
aspect   1912    aspe		46:15		01,17	balanc	ed ra	164-16				
				30-11	170:17	170:22	201.20				
	<b>asks</b> [1] 95:14						192:5		116:23		
	aspect [4]	119:11			1						211.20
Assembly 13   153-11   202-23   207-16   189-4   202-12   189-12   202-12   189-12   202-12   189-12   202-12   189-12   202-12		181:4							142:9		2.17
asspirations [2] 7-6 6824 Assembly [3] 8-15 127-6 127-16 127-6 127-16 127-6 127-16 127-7-1 127-16 127-7-7-1 127-16 127-7-7-1 127-1-7-1 138-1 123-7 127-1-7-1 138-1 123-7 127-1-7-1 138-1 123-7 127-1-7-1 138-1 123-7 127-1-7-1 138-1 123-7 127-1-7-1 138-1 123-7 127-1-7-1 138-1 123-7 127-1-7-1 138-1 123-7 127-1-7-1 138-1 123-7 127-1-7-1 138-1 123-7 127-1-7-1 138-1 123-7 127-1-7-1 138-1 123-7 127-1-7-1 138-1 123-7 123											
	3			188:17				beat [2] 145:24			
Assembly		7:6		1.6		132:15	132:21		190:12		100.20
Assertionly 3  Asse	1									I .	89:3
Sascas   1		8:15							14:24	89:21 125:24	
		04.54					174:16				164:18
Attivide									157:16		
Sascassing	1							1	00.17		
Akwater		/ /:1							99:17		180:17
	I .	106.25									
166.22   3850SSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSS	1			100.0					103:13		
		81:7	audience 181	4:13				I	<i>(5.</i> 01	biological [3]	108:17
The content of the	1	Λ1	69:12 122:12								
Silfo   Silf		-		189:23	baselin	<b>IC</b> [1]	151:20				208:17
Second   S					bashed	[1]	95:10				
Sassing   1   165:9   205:4   3:13   3:13   3:13   3:13   3:13   3:146:23   3:15   3		140:16		214:9				beginning 191	12:4		216:21
16:59   20:54   20:54   20:52   20:5			1	.•							
16:22   associated		165:9		/ <b>in</b> [1]					209:3		
1823   2324   2324   2325   2326   2424   2326   2427   2414   2415   199:1   24125   2414   2415   2414   24125   2414   24								l e			
autograph [i]   10:4   38:1   146:23   148:19   204:20   204:20   204:20   204:20   204:20   204:20   204:20   204:20   204:21   203:3   218:22   203:3   218:22   213   2:25   3:3   35:12   35:15   38:17   34:23   34:25   38:10   38:11   143:22   38:10   38:11   143:22   203:3   38:10   38:11   143:22   205:3   38:10   38:11   143:22   205:3   205:20   202:25   204:24   24:15   199:14   24:25   205:3   205:20   202:25   204:24   24:15   199:14   24:25   205:3   205:20   202:25   204:24   24:15   199:14   24:25   205:3   205:3   205:20   202:25   204:24   24:15   199:14   24:25   205:3   205:3   205:20   202:25   204:24   205:3   205:3   205:20   202:25   204:24   205:3   205:				[1]				behind [3]	117:5		171.10
ASSOCIATES [2]   169:11				10.4							09.12
ASSOCIATES [2] 1:23 218:22  Association [8] 2:7  23:12 3:12:3 38:10 38:11 143:22  203:10  Assume [4] 24:14  24:15 199:14 214:25  assume [4] 45:8  77:24 104:6 163:24  assuming [2] 167:10  169:11  avariable [17] 45:8  Avenue [3] 1:24  173:3 218:22  Avenue [3] 1:24  173:1 219:23  Avenue [3] 1:24  173:3 218:22  Avenue [3] 1:24  173:1 18:15 144:20  169:11  avariable [17] 4:17  Available [17] 4:18  Available [17] 4:17  Available [17] 4:18  Available [17] 4:18  Available [17] 4:18  Available [17] 4:18  Available [17] 4:17  Available [17] 4:18  Avenue [3] 1:24  Avenue [3] 1		146:23									
Association		S 101		[1]							
Association [8] 2:7 2:13		<b>3</b> [2]		4.17	205:10	205:24			31:21		191:23
2:13   2:25   3:3   35:15   38:7   38:10   38:11   143:22   176:14   176:18   176:18   176:19   183:23   176:17   177:8   176:18   177:24   104:6   163:24   205:3   202:9   202:25   204:24   205:3   202:9   202:25   204:24   205:3   202:9   202:25   204:24   205:3   202:9   202:25   204:24   205:3   202:9   202:25   204:24   205:3   202:9   202:25   204:24   205:3   202:9   202:25   204:24   205:3   202:9   202:25   204:24   205:3   202:9   202:25   204:24   205:3   202:9   202:25   204:24   205:3   204:24   205:3   202:9   202:25   203:10   202:9   202:25   203:10   202:9   202:25   203:10   202:9   202:25   203:10   202:9   202:25   203:10   202:9   202:25   203:10   202:9   202:25   203:10   202:9   202:25   203:25   203:10   202:9   202:25   203:25   203:10   203:10   203:10   203:10   203:10   203:10   203:10   203:10   203:10   203:10		2.7			basin [c	5]	45:13				144.0
115:18   121:5   203:10   38:11   143:22   166:11   177:10   183:23   202:25   204:24   24:15   199:14   24:25   24:45   199:14   24:25   205:3   20	2:13 2:25	3:3					176:12		3:3		144.0
assume [4]	115:18 115:18	121:5									20.1
assume [4]         24:15         199:14         24:15         199:14         24:15         199:14         24:25         assumed [4]         45:8         Avenue [3]         1:24         basis [3] 14:11         25:15         beneficial [4]         8.9         9:12         49:23         212:2         213:3         213:2         213:3         213:2         213:2         213:3         213:2         213:2         213:3         213:2         213:3         213:2         213:3         213:2         213:3         213:2         213:3         213:2         213:3         213:2         213:3         213:2         213:3         213:2         213:3         213:2         213:3         213:2         213:3         213:2         213:3         213:2         213:3         213:2         213:3         213:2         213:3         213:2         213:3         213:2         213:2         213:3         213:2         213:2         213:2         212:13         213:2         213:2         213:2         212:13         213:2         213:2         213:2         213:2         213:2         213:2         213:2         213:2         213:2         212:1         213:2         213:2         212:1         212:2         213:2         213:2         213:2         212:2	203:10						176:13		££.10		
24:15   199:14   214:25   215:16   215:17   215:16   215:17   215:16   21	,			204:24			05.15				
17:34   104:6   163:24   173:3   218:22     129:23   33:4   4:8   30:16   120:4   168:2   173:19   182:14     30:17   30:19   50:10   193:21   207:24   212:23     30:17   30:19   50:10   193:21   207:24   212:23     30:17   30:19   50:10     193:21   207:24   212:23     30:17   30:19   50:10     193:21   207:24   212:23     30:17   30:19   50:10     193:21   207:24   212:23     30:17   30:19   50:10     193:21   207:24   212:23     30:17   30:19   50:10     193:21   207:24   212:23     30:17   30:19   50:10     193:21   207:24   212:23     30:17   30:19   50:10     193:21   207:24   212:23     30:17   30:19   50:10     193:21   207:24   212:23     30:17   30:19   50:10     193:21   207:24   212:23     30:17   30:19   50:10     193:21   207:24   212:23     30:17   30:19   50:10     193:21   207:24   212:23     30:17   30:19   50:10     193:21   207:24   212:23     30:17   30:19   50:10     193:21   207:24   212:23     30:17   30:19   50:10     193:21   207:24   212:23     30:17   30:19   50:10     193:21   207:24   212:23     30:17   30:19   50:10     193:21   207:24   212:23     30:17   30:19   50:10     193:21   207:24   212:23     30:17   30:19   50:10     193:21   207:24   212:23     30:17   30:19				1.24		114:11	25:15				I
Trick   104:6   163:24   assuming   21   167:10   169:11   28:2   183:15   30:17   30:19   50:10   193:21   207:24   212:23   28:2   213:19   167:18   awards   11   179:18   aware   77   7:14   82:1   141:1   196:8   216:17   216:17   216:18   213:25   214:2   214:4   214:15   183:11   184:2   218:7   218:8   216:17   216:18   218:7   218:8   216:17   216:17   216:18   218:14   209:7   20:25   218:8   218:14   209:7   20:25   218:8   218:14				1.47	1	2.5	2.12			board [4]	53:16
169:11   183:15   184:20   183:15   184:20   183:15   1820   1820   183:15   1820				129-23						128:6 129:13	
assumption [5]   18:1   18:15   144:20   167:18   aware [7]   7:14   167:18   assumptions [2]   17:19   18:20   216:17   216:17   216:17   216:18   216:17   216:17   216:18		167:10									28:2
18:11   18:15   144:20   167:18   18:15   144:20   167:18   18:15   144:20   167:18   179:18   18:20   179:18   179:18   179:19   18:20   18:20   18:21   141:1   196:8   216:17   216:18   216:17   216:18   18:15   108:20   179:7   179:12   213:25   214:2   214:4   213:25   214:2   214:4   213:25   214:2   214:4   213:25   214:2   214:4   213:25   214:2   214:4   213:25   214:2   214:4   213:25   214:2   214:4   214:15   167:21   216:18   18:28   18:2:22   186:24   187:17   194:12   194:15   199:2   199:4   10:16   116:22   143:15   10:16   116:22   13:16		10.1		64:8	77:9	86:5	98:14				
167:18											
assumptions [2]       82:1 141:1 196:8 216:17 216:18       17:19 18:20       17:19 18:20       17:14 177:15 178:9 139:22 186:24 177:14 177:15 178:9 182:8 182:22 186:24 179:23 197:4 208:2 179:23 199:4 199:3 199:3 199:3 109		177.4U									
17:19   18:20   216:17   216:18   assurance [10]   37:23   75:22   108:15   108:20   107:7   108:15   213:25   214:2   214:4   213:25   214:2   214:4   213:25   214:2   214:4   213:25   214:2   214:4   213:25   214:2   214:4   213:25   214:2   214:4   213:25   214:2   214:4   213:15   109:2   199:4   218:7   218:8   213:16		)1						53:23 120:1	142:11		
assurance [10] 37:23       awareness [2] 106:12 107:7       187:17 194:12 194:15 199:2 199:4       187:17 194:12 194:15 199:2 199:4       187:17 194:12 194:15 199:2 199:4       187:17 194:12 194:15 199:2 199:4       187:17 194:12 194:15 199:2 199:4       187:17 194:12 194:15 199:2 199:4       187:17 194:12 194:15 199:2 199:4       187:17 194:12 194:15 199:2 199:4       187:17 194:12 194:15 199:2 199:4       187:17 194:12 194:15 199:2 199:4       187:17 194:12 194:15 199:2 199:4       187:17 194:12 194:15 199:2 199:4       188:18 109:19 196:14       189:2 199:4       Bay-Delta [6] 1:4       100:16 116:22 143:15 163:19 196:14       189:2 143:15 163:19 196:14       189:2 143:15 163:19 196:14       189:2 143:15 163:19 196:14       189:2 143:15 163:19 196:14       189:2 143:15 163:19 196:14       189:2 143:15 163:19 196:14       189:2 143:15 163:19 196:14       189:2 143:15 163:19 196:14       189:2 143:15 163:19 196:14       189:2 143:15 163:19 196:14       189:2 143:15 163:19 196:14       189:2 143:15 163:19 196:14       189:2 143:15 163:19 196:14       189:2 143:15 163:19 196:14       189:2 143:15 163:19 196:14       189:2 143:15 163:19 196:14       189:2 143:15 163:19 196:14       189:2 143:15 163:19 196:14       189:2 143:15 16		-1									
75:22 108:15 108:20 110:9 179:7 179:12 213:25 214:2 214:4  assurances [33] 16:2 38:18 50:23 51:1 55:21 76:3 101:17 108:4 108:11 108:13 109:3 109:3 110:7 110:8 110:18 110:19 111:24 112:8 112:18  107:7  1109:2 199:4  Bay-Delta [6] 1:4 10:16 116:22 143:15 218:7 218:8  BDAC [51] 4:14 4:15 4:18 4:25 5:13 6:2 6:8 11:2 13:10 13:17 16:8 35:22 36:12 11:2 13:10 13:17 16:8 35:22 36:12 11:2 13:10 13:17 16:8 35:22 36:12 18:15 213:16 21:16		37:23		106:12	187:17	194:12					
110:9 179:7 179:12 213:25 214:2 214:4 93:1 94:23 114:3 114:15 183:11 184:2 218:7 218:8 38:18 50:23 51:1 55:21 76:3 101:17 108:4 108:11 108:13 109:3 109:13 110:7 110:8 110:18 110:19 111:24 112:8 112:18 112:	75:22 108:15				1						
213:25 214:2 214:4 93:1 94:23 114:3 10:16 116:22 143:15 218:8  assurances [33] 16:2 awful [2] 33:1 84:2 218:7 218:8  55:21 76:3 101:17 108:4 108:11 108:13 109:3 109:13 110:7 110:8 110:18 110:19 111:24 112:8 112:18 114:3											
assurances [33] 16:2       38:18 50:23 51:1     awful [2]     33:1       55:21 76:3 101:17 108:4 108:11 108:13 109:3 109:13 110:7 110:8 110:18 110:19 111:24 112:8 112:18     babbling [1] 191:4 112:8 112:18     babbling [1] 191:4 112:8 112:18     backdrop [2] 20:25 23:22 23:22 48:20 56:20 56:20 56:22     51:3 6:2 6:8 4:14 4:15 4:18 4:25 5:13 6:2 6:8 112:17 13:10 13:17 1	L .						143:15				133:13
38:18 50:23 51:1 55:21 76:3 101:17 167:21 33:1 BDAC[51] 4:14 4:15 4:18 4:25 5:13 6:2 6:8 110:18 110:19 111:24 112:8 112:1					1		4 1 4	166:20 210:20			
108:4 108:11 108:13   babbling [1] 191:4   5:13 6:2 6:8   110:8 110:18 110:19   111:24 112:8 112:18   112:18				33:1				211:23		<b>bog</b> [1] 164:8	
109:3 109:13 110:7 110:8 110:18 110:19 111:24 112:8 112:18				101.4	1						180:17
110:8 110:18 110:19   111:24 112:8 112:18   112:					,						
111:24 112:8 112:18   23:22   48:20 56:20 56:22   9:17 12:9 15:24   bonding (1) 130:19	110:8 110:18	110:19		20:23	16:8	35:22	36:12			130:3 130:6	
114;2 138;0 138;9   Vacagiound [2] 100.23   57;9 69;21 78;16   41;20 44;21 30;12				100.25						bonding [1]	130:19
	114;2 138:6	138:9	[2]	100.23	3/:9	о <del>у</del> :21	/8:16	71,20 77,21	JU.12		

133:13

132:19

32:16

112:10

57:13

182:19

203:21

84:2

176:10

191:22

218:3

certify [1]

cetera (3)

CFS [19] 23:13

121:7

23:17

53:25

59:14

64:17

65:16

57:21

110:4

Chair [7]

68:7

218:16

211:25

25:15

58:18

60:15

65:6

65:17

87:15

151:8

68:9

218:4

79:5

23:13

53:4

59:1

60:20

65:14

65:18

7:24

108:24

186:3

2:12 PORTALE & ASSOCIATES DEPOSITION REPORTERS

2:2

bonds [3]

bones [1]

books [1]

3:2

25:24

41:8

44:6

65:10

154:8

bottom [2]

bounty [1]

boxes [1]

2:16

91:22

109:2

break [4]

126:7

167:1

193:7

216:7

198:21

42:15

101:6

brings [2]

broad [12]

169:9

20:18

71:24

88:5

197:3

**boy**[1] 20:14

**brain** [1] 79:2

breaching [1]

breakfast [2]

brief [9] 27:1

briefing [2]

briefings [1]

**bring** [8] 6:24

bringing [6]

138:25 215:7

167:20 195:9

broadened [1]

broader [2]

broadest [1]

bromides [1]

brooks

43:10

58:17

96:15

brought [13]

58:9

113:4

21:14

72:22

127:3

50:16

168:15 169:16 187:13

74:5

75:18

162:5

32:15

12:3

83:3

77:8

191:4

16:17

51:10

92:4

156:19 159:19

147:24

151:9

153:9

162:24

166:14

169:12

186:11

187:18

207:18

212:24

1:24

2:10

CalFed's [1]

California [33]

201:8

148:8

151:9

154:9

163:24

166:18

179:20

186:14

189:10

201:15

208:6

briefly [4]

breadth [2]

91:6

96:20

159:1

44:2

bore [1] 132:7

111:20 153:1

22:8

26:22

41:10

64:12

66:19

196:3

8:24 Index Page 4

2:12

79:7

154:14

15:12

34:17

66:6

183:9

11:9

46:5

Chamber [3]

chance [5]

change [11]

changed [6]

changes [2]

139:2

160:17

21:18

66:14

211:6

14:6

46:8

45:1

134:18 203:10

154:8

31:24

56:18

112:6

29:14

56:23

carries [1]

carry [4] 116:5

carrying [2]

cascading [1]

case [9] 21:2

142:15 182:7

191:16 196:3

cases [8] 33:25

138:14 168:9

176:10 176:12

cash [1] 204:22

168:17

204:2

166:11 168:24

148:25

151:16

162:13

166:12

182:20

186:15

201:2

203:1

209:20

162:4

1:12

2:7

2:14

169.3

BDAC MEE	TING		CondenseIt	TM	changing - concerns
211:7		47:12 47:19 47:20	command [1] 14	:6 147:20 148:14 148:2	5 201:16 213:12
changing [2]	35:17	48:11 49:15 50:4	commend [1] 18	4:3 153:25 154:23 154:2	
115:24		106:4 112:16 138:6 140:19 142:5 152:13	comment [33] 4:	155:11 156:17 156:2	$\frac{0}{2}$   13:20  14:10 15:5
channel [7]	21:13	140:19 142:5 152:13 155:10 162:3	5:2 5:15 6:	1   15/:15   161:3   161:1	4   13.3 13.7 13.24
30:11 30:22	31:22	clearly [19] 51:12		20 194-11 194-14 194-1	
32:4 32:10	32:13	53:12 58:2 86:4		184:20 184:23 185:4 185:5 185:18	
channels [13] 21:4 21:12	20:2 21:14	95:20 96:2 102:23		1350   1833   18311   18311	9 82:15 86:7 105:7
22:19 22:24	23:11	119:19 120:10 120:12		1.20   180:8	145:8 148:25 155:1
29:6 31:25	32:21	120:19 121:25 140:15 158:19 163:4 164:4		8:23   commonly [1] 96:18	170:16 186:10 200:6
89:4 191:19		158:19 163:4 164:4 165:22 198:4 201:8		7:19 <b>communicate</b> [1] 4:11 11:4	200:10 200:20 201:21
characteristic	<b>S</b> [1]	climax [1] 128:22		I	composed [1] 209:24
14:20		climb [1] 129:13	194:13 216:20	1:25   <b>communication</b> [3]   9:8   9:20   151:8	comprehension [2] 106:13 106:16
characterize [1		clock [1] 133:22	commenting [1]	communities [6]	comprehensive [6]
characterized 29:17	[1]	close [6] 4:21 88:13	102:14	78:1 99:1 114:2	
charge [1]	166:4	123:22 126:3 157:18	comments [73] 5:	4	0   118:25   119:3   132:8
charged [1]	8:12	181:14	6:10 6:10 6: 6:21 7:6 7:		compromise [1]
charter [2]	73:24	closely [6] 40:23	6:21 7:6 7: 9:5 9:14 9:	20   11.17 02.10 70.7	59:10
166:17	73:24	71:14 121:17 122:22		23 95:17 96:11 108:1 :22 122:17 122:20 123:1	_  compacer areculing
check [2]	101:3	192:11 204:17	21:16 21:20 29	:11   133:20   134:1   137:2	
193:14	101.5	closer[1] 166:19		:18   143:11 144:13 185:1	6 COMPUTERIZED
checked [1]	176:20	closing [1] 125:21		:21   188:22   189:1   196:1 :25   211:1   211:16   211:1	11
checklist	88:19	CM [1] 1:20		:25   211:1 211:16 211:1 :13   211:20 213:7	166:18
chemical [1]	192:6	co-sponsor[1] 151:23		.25	
chemicals [3]	27:25	coalition [2] 8:14   127:4	86:23 90:15 91	10	
114:15 192:4	- / <b>.-</b>	coastal [1] 152:1		-	20:21
<b>chief</b> [1] 196:15		cognizant [1] 170:22		7:5 <b>compare</b> [2] 65:21 3:23 194:16	concept [14] 14:8
chinook [1]	30:9	cohorts [1] 126:9		5:24 compared [5] 13:4	18:11 43:5 51:7
chip [1] 114:3		coincidental [1]		6:15   39:11 76:11 120:4	51:9 62:18 91:20 92:4 92:7 158:23
chlorides [1]	77:8	17:14		8:23 184:11	160.3 160.7 182.11
choice [1]	185:20	collaborate[1] 11:24		1:14   comparison [1] 159:1	5   196:16
choices [5]	76:8	collaboration [6]		3:12   compatibility [1]	conceptionally [1]
78:19 79:10	79:12	11:11 72:8 201:3		5:5 60:23	201:10
146:21		201:11 211:15 211:20		5:17   compatible [1] 122:4	00110 P 10 [5]
choose [1]	9:18	collaborative [3]		7.4 Componing [1] 75.1	120:22 121:12
choosing [1]	9:14	11:21 31:14 86:14	Commerce [3] 2:	compensated [1]	conceptual[1] 84:7
chosen [1]	204:10	collect [1] 196:9	134:18 203:10	complete [2] 61:15	conceptually [3] 23:13 63:6 155:3
Chronicle [1]	132:22	collection [1] 114:19	commercial [1] 9:	11   131:1	concern [30] 7:14
church [1]	114:22	collective [1] 69:23	Commission [1]	completed [1] 162:1	8 47:5 52:2 52:25
cite[1] 131:11	24.0	collectively [1] 99:23	2:3	completely [1] 131:2	2 53:9 53:15 55:11
cities [1]	96:9	collector's [1] 10:2	commitment [2]	completion [3] 16:19	55:24 58:12 63:15
city [3] 3:8 188:25	172:24	combination [3] 67:7 159:7 212:18	152:10 161:11	162:23 163:25	81:10 81:24 82:12 90:20 100:13 118:9
Clair [1] 175:9		combinations [1]	commitments [3]	7.22   complex [4] 14:13	138:9 146:1 146:7
Clara [1]	2:18	157:19	committee [8] 7:	78:25 152:5 152:0	151.21 151.21 155.21
clarification [7		combine [1] 201:7		8.16   compliance [5] 77:16	155:17 175:1 179:10
48:5 49:18	50:17	combined [8] 15:14	164:16 171:8 20	2:3 211:7 211:10 212:2 2:3 212:23	1   179:24 186:23 188:3 195:17 207:22
52:23 58:2	62:13	19:4 19:7 20:10	202:5	complicated m	concerned [15] 23:1
93:24		23:22 75:18 147:11 212:20	<b>common</b> [74] 8:3	132:9	43:15 49:10 117:15
clarifications 47:2 51:17	[ <b>6]</b> 56:7	combining [1] 17:10		:12   complications [2]	130:10 132:6 132:14
57:1 57:6	137:3		14:21 14:25 15	:2 64:4 98:25	132:20 143:2 145:22 147:4 173:19 175:23
clarifies [1]	48:4	comfort [1]   125:25   comfortable [5] 139:1		:7   compliment [1] 202:1	0 179:21 179:25
clarify [8]	9:13	153:10 172:1 200:18	19:8 19:19 19 22:4 23:23 24	:22 <b>comply</b> [1] 152:1	concerning (1) 67:21
47:14 49:22	58:14	207:3		:10   complying [1] 152:1	0 concerns (28) 6:16
138:12 161:4	185:3	comforting [2] 33:7	28:12 29:8 31	:2   component [27] 15:23	7:2 35:7 46:5
186:11	206.2	199:15		23:12 41:4 67:8 76:13 76:14 79:9	47:22 51:1 52:1
clarity [1]	206:3	coming [17] 8:23	34:14 35:20 37 47:9 47:12 47	:20 79:10 82:12 85:5	54:1 74:25 75:4 81:2 87:2 101:12
Clark [1]	131:15	49:9 61:11 86:16 98:8 114:10 116:22		:5 85:10 86:4 92:21	111:22 112:23 124:2
classes [1]	78:20	122:24 140:7 172:25	61:11 62:22 73	:7 93:19 98:12 101:2	0   124:20 137:3 137:5
clean [3] 117:12 191:4	152:12	173:4 173:9 173:18		:23   125:13 133:8 146:6 3:2   147:4 147:19 148:1	157.22 151.5 155.10
clear [15]	35:12	174:18 187:20 189:19		3:2 5:21   147:4   147:19   148:1 200:4   200:14   201:1	
[15]		203:20	110,02 130,0 19	J	103.7 103.7 103.11
DODTALE	ACCO	CIATES DEPOSIT	TON DEDODTE	00	Index Page 5

BDAC MEETING		CondenseIt <sup>™</sup>		conclude - customer
<b>conclude</b> [2] 5:10	108:9 115:17 115:18	contemplated [5]	147:11 161:7 198:14	course [13] 33:9
79:14	115:19 198:13 210:21	50:8 83:25 84:2	204:11	87:9 89:16 114:20
concluded [1] 92:19	210:23 211:3 211:6 211:19 211:22 212:11	85:21 165:23 contemplating [1]	conveyed [2] 38:9   43:14	134:3 137:20 139:25 168:1 177:5 178:14
<b>conclusion</b> [4] 11:6 12:23 41:19 93:7	212:19 213:6 213:15	114:21	43:14   convinced [2] 107:25	202:6 203:14 214:17
conclusions [3] 83:22	213:22 214:21 215:10	content [1] 132:6	128:24	courses [2] 96:8
184:13 204:3	215:11 215:18	context [6] 15:18	cooperates [1] 55:21	97:2
concur [2] 57:19	<b>conserve</b> [2] 38:25	16:6 56:17 64:1	cooperation [2] 8:14	court [1] 180:10
140:13	conserving [1] 26:8	72:1 91:14	11:11	<b>cover</b> [2] 74:15
concurrence [1] 135:15	consider [6] 36:1	continually [1] 160:1	cooperative [1] 64:9	covered [2] 154:21
condition [2] 208:14	48:21 96:5 180:22	continuation [1]	coordinator [1] 122:16	210:13
208:16  conditioning[1]	187:16 192:21	continue [14] 15:2	copies [2] 4:16 203:11	<b>covering</b> [1] 76:5
160:21	considerable [6] 30:2 30:18 30:23	15:23 85:19 98:5	core [5] 14:23 47:16	covers [2] 29:20
conditions [6] 34:24	56:2 62:1 136:23	124:24 143:14 143:25	47:21 76:13 143:17	150:21
59:16 59:16 59:22	consideration [8]	145:21 148:8 160:4 208:5 209:23 212:12	corner [1] 86:16	cowboy [1] 193:10
110:16 193:21	21:1 21:7 58:21	213:12	Corps [2] 190:15	craft [1] 52:21
conducting [1] 110:5	93:10 93:20 145:15 187:8 188:5	continued [3] 61:4	190:20	create [4] 49:19 94:21 104:10 137:10
conference [1] 128:15	considerations [1]	83:24 209:20	correct [7] 25:20	created [1] 120:14
confidence [8] 79:15 99:2 104:25 105:1	195:12	continues [3] 95:5 148:13 163:13	34:6 63:2 122:8 153:15 218:10 218:11	creates [1] 43:23
105:15 157:6 205:7	considered [17] 21:6	148:13 163:13   continuing [6] 146:1	correctly [1] 5:6	creating [4] 22:25
206:22	21:21 22:12 22:17	148:11 160:1 173:13	correlated [1] 204:17	80:17 83:6 108:6
configuration [4]	48:19 50:21 64:17 71:25 74:9 74:10	200:4 216:11	cost [18] 88:22 111:6	creative [2] 190:3
23:14 23:20 55:17 56:13	78:18 147:10 148:14	Contra [1] 2:6	111:7 111:11 111:16	196:20
confining [1] 181:13	159:14 178:15 181:12	contract [3] 163:22	119:4 120:1 120:4 120:9 122:1 122:6	<b>creator</b> [2] 114:24
conflict [4] 11:12	212:5	181:22 188:24	133:14 142:6 158:2	credibility [2] 104:10
54:11 63:12 120:12	considering [3] 123:2 123:3 150:9	contractor[1] 181:23	159:1 178:3 204:4	205:20
conflicts [2] 18:19	consist [1] 18:24	contrary [1] 120:8	204:19	credit [1] 131:7
121:13	consistent [4] 28:17	contrast [1] 45:7 contribute [4] 79:6	Costa [7] 2:6	credits [1] 27:24
confused [1] 25:13	28:21 29:3 63:6	contribute [4] 79:6 157:23 162:23 163:7	98:9 98:16 128:23 131:6 131:12 132:17	criteria [9] 51:6
confusing [1] 56:21	consolidate [1] 33:20	contributed [1] 183:18	costs [11] 113:14	52:5 52:10 52:17
confusion [2] 180:23	consolidated [1]	contribution [2]	120:10 120:17 120:20	52:22 54:10 54:13 55:5 59:9
congratulations [1]	52:17	142:3 178:11	142:10 145:10 204:4	critical [9] 30:15
134:12	consolidation [1]	control [3] 29:1	204:19 205:4 206:10 206:13	30:15 69:20 86:6
conjunctive [6] 19:6	34:1 constant [1] 59:13	140:6 150:6	Council [21] 1:4	86:13 110:14 128:9
20:10 23:21 146:19	constant [1] 59:13 constantly [4] 15:24	controversial [2]   142:18   149:18	2:1 2:6 3:1	133:25 144:12
176:1 176:21	85:9 166:22 198:4	controversies [2]	3:9 4:8 41:18	<b>criticism</b> [3] 106:5 110:4 139:25
connection [1] 149:6	constituencies [1]	152:18 152:21	49:2 86:5 103:1 117:17 132:9 133:6	criticize [1] 106:7
<b>cons</b> [3] 79:8 140:16 140:20	131:14	Convention [2] 1:11	193:19 193:22 210:22	critique [1] 184:23
consensus [21] 7:2	constituents [1]	131:21	210:23 211:22 212:12	crop [1] 27:25
69:3 70:5 70:14	101:16	conventional [1]	218:7 218:9	cropping [2] 35:17
71:12 71:12 71:18	Constitutional [2] 179:17 179:21	191:11	count [1] 203:6	41:23
77:20 79:7 98:6 118:12 128:2 131:10	constrain [2] 53:7	conversation [3] 5:13 67:20 209:4	<b>counties</b> [6] 177:6 179:12 179:23 188:4	crops [5] 33:24
149:19 151:12 152:7	60:20	conversion [15] 27:17	188:6 194:12	35:18 40:11 92:10 191:14
153:6 164:14 167:11	constrained [1] 133:18	48:13 48:18 48:21	country [2] 94:13	crossed [1] 207:2
184:8 207:20	constraints [1] 18:18	56:9 56:11 57:4	141:21	crucial [1] 107:17
consequences [1]	construction [1]	66:3 125:13 143:4 143:9 143:20 143:24	county [12] 3:15	crunching [1] 118:21
consequently [1]	146:23	144:6 144:9	111:12 114:12 115:24 160:20 177:4 178:22	crystallize [1] 88:3
94:23	construed [2] 58:5 58:8	conversions [2] 48:24	181:21 188:9 188:25	CSR <sub>[2]</sub> 1:20 218:24
conservation [53]	consult [1] 55:11	125:11	218:2 218:17	cubic [3] 54:21
27:17 35:2 35:3	consultants [1] 11:1	converted [1] 150:17	couple [20] 12:1	65:2 173:4
35:14 37:9 37:18 38:12 38:19 38:22	consumptive [2]	converting [2] 76:23	17:19 21:24 29:11 31:23 33:13 46:21	cumulative [1] 84:22
39:2 39:3 39:9	49:21 59:23	80:6 convey [1] 38:24	47:8 51:21 64:12	curious [2] 9:14
39:14 39:20 39:22	cont'd[1] 3:1	convey [1] 38:24   conveyance [22]	87:9 90:12 92:15	109:14
40:5 41:18 42:1 43:2 43:24 44:16	contained [2] 78:10	15:5 18:24 19:11	94:4 98:2 104:12 107:5 124:4 158:5	cursory [1] 157:17
44:18 91:10 91:11	125:5	20:5 21:1 21:2	198:7	curtailed [1] 33:16
91:16 91:21 92:1	contains [1] 204:15	21:22 22:1 23:10	coupled [5] 19:22	curtailments [1] 59:18
92:6 92:8 92:12	contaminants [1]	24:3 34:17 34:23 39:11 39:11 44:4	22:2 110:17 198:15	<b>customer</b> [5] 39:25
103:1 103:6 106:3	117:13	50:3 53:1 147:3	199:8	40:6 40:13 41:14
POPTATE & ACCO	OCIATES DEPOSITI	ON DEDODTEDS		Index Page 6

BDAC MEET	TING		CondenseIt <sup>™</sup>					custom	iers - I	Director	
160:13		decides [1]	67:11	62:8	62:8		described [7]	43:22	diagnos	stic [1]	208:17
customers [1]	34:22	decision [9]	15:18	deliver	<b>y</b> [2]	60:4	47:6 53:1	72:20	dialogu	<b>e</b> [1]	196:7
cut [1] 39:24		15:21 71:10	84:18	104:7			124:10 125:4	134:2	Diamor	1 <b>d</b> [1]	2:17
cutbacks [1]	96:7	119:24 119:25 155:25 165:8	130:2	Delta [1		2:11	describing [1]	50:13	Dick [12	I	23:6
cuts [1] 138:7		decision-maki	<b>*</b>	4:8 19:3	15:12 19:5	15:14 20:2	description [4] 45:2 61:3	27:1 125:5	23:9	27:8	29:9
CVPIA [12]	118:25	87:20	ng [1]	20:9	20:18	20.2	descriptions [2		31:17 54:17	34:9 63:5	54:16 100:6
	119:16	decisions [13]	24:3	21:7	22:25	23:3	27:13 46:11	J	141:19		100:0
119:20 120:3	120:7	35:16 56:14	67:11	23:11	23:21	28:25	design [4]	48:1	differen		19:10
120:10 120:19 121:24 163:2	121:17	71:8 71:17	78:23	29:5	29:6	30:1	60:12 60:21	63:16	37:13	148:24	17.10
cycle [3] 191:7	192:9	79:12 80:11	87:13	30:10 31:4	30:11 32:22	30:13 33:19	Designated [2]	3:6	differen	ices m	212:5
192:11	174,7	90:13 138:24		37:14	38:9	38:25	3:10		differen	nt (64)	8:7
Cynthia [1]	133:21	decline [4] 190:24 208:25	78:4 208:25	38:25	39:11	45:9	designing [1]	60:24	12:7	13:1	15:15
dam [2] 45:18	190:19	declined [1]	32:18	45:24	46:7	46:7	desirable [1]	7:1	16:7	16:12	19:4
damage [2]	45:25	declining [1]	78:4	46:8 52:16	50:3 53:5	50:10 55:16	desire [1]	141:8	19:18 20:24	19:19 21:24	19:22 22:2
54:25		decomposed [1		58:20	60:5	60:9	desperately [1]	178:22	20.24	23:4	23:19
Dan [23] 7:9	7:11	32:14	J	62:9	75:21	75:23	despite [2]	8:2	26:6	33:22	33:23
7:15 7:19	67:23	decrease [1]	91:13	76:2	76:24	77:12	75:16		33:23	34:13	38:5
67:24 88:14	99:9	dedication [1]	122:24	78:4	78:10	78:11	destroyed [1]	190:21	39:7	44:19	47:13
99:11 99:12 111:3 112:22	108:5 113:4	deep [1] 105:14	122,27	82:12 95:1	86:5 98:14	89:6 99:6	detail [23]	8:19	52:9 55:18	54:23 56:13	55:6 60:7
	113:4	Defense [2]	2:21	103:17		99:6 108:18	15:16 15:25	54:17	82:25	83:5	83:24
	164:10	3:9	2.21	109:4		113:2	72:25 84:5	84:6	85:21	90:16	93:15
170:5 170:6	170:10	defensible [1]	200:19	113:6	117:16	147:19	84:14 86:7 88:2 89:14	86:12 98:13	105:7		114:23
Daniel [9]	29:11	defer [2] 54:16	102:3	148:7		148:23		118:8	121:25		138:3
31:19 33:1	33:13	deficiencies [1		149:4 149:9	149:6 149:14	149:8 149:20	125:17 137:6	137:8	138:5 143:9	138:7 144:14	138:8 145:3
54:18 63:11 64:25 100:6	64:21	deficient [1]	111:7	149:22	150:2	150:13	150:25 158:15	206:21	145:8	145:9	158:21
data [2] 80:11	86:9	define [7]	76:9	150:14	150:16	150:17	208:11	07.10	176:18	185:6	185:8
	152:21	82:22 102:23	104:12		159:24		detailed [8] 51:7 84:21	27:13 85:1		187:19	
182:23	132,21	142:10 207:24	208:9		174:25 179:1	178:9 182:8	90:9 103:5	118:21	197:8 209:10	203:25	209:9 214:3
David [7]	2:20	defined [5]	50:10	182:11	182:17		137:10	110.21	differen		
56:4 89:12	104:22	62:17 75:17	102:25		194:16		details [3]	89:17	differir		191:10 55:4
130:18 133:20	188:1	200:25		199:4	207:25		118:20 185:10		difficul		
days [6] 72:12	93:6	defining [4]	15:3	208:21	209:22	214:22	determination	[1]	84:17	เนเซา 84:21	79:18 149:18
128:14 128:18	128:21	83:17 103:2	119:8	215:1	215:4	24.12	125:10		150:7	157:4	157:16
130:17	4 .	definitely [1]	161:9	demano 39:15	1 [21] 40:6	34:12 41:16	determine [3]	51:13	211:9		
de-establishme	ent [1]	<b>definition</b> [8] 9:6 12:12	9:5 12:21	41:19	42:23	92:11	61:10 113:6	05.10	difficul	lty [2]	52:7
deadline [1]	128:10	88:25 93:22	137:24	144:13	145:5	145:12	determined [1]		84:4	_	
deal [26] 14:13	28:16	155:23			155:18		determining [1]		digestil		189:16
28:19 29:25	33:14	definitions [3]	93:18	155:21 156:9	156:1 159:19	156:3 160:1	develop [13] 38:24 44:1	15:25 48:1	digestic		141:7
54:14 63:17	64:2	94:2 138:11		160:11	185:13	100.1	51:5 51:7	59:9	diked [1		30:19
64:4 90:22	92:22	definitive [1]	93:16	demand		60:22	80:23 85:7	135:2	dikes [1		30:19
	111:13	degradation [1]		144:18	198:17		158:17 162:15		dilute [1		173:14
134:5 134:11 148:9 154:23		degrade [1]	78:11	199:1			developed [11]		dinner		17:23
155:2 166:13		degraded [1]	32:6	Depart			31:13 48:6	48:11	direct [1		97:16
183:7 192:2	216:8	degree [5]	70:4	1	115:16		74:20 93:18 130:25 158:14	110:17 201:11	direction		91:3
dealing [11]	11:9	71:12 105:10	121:11	depend		39:3	207:18		99:18		
18:19 31:2	31:3	161:13	1.00.10	depend			developing [5]	73:13	directly		73:23
34:1 56:1 92:16 104:15	81:12 122:10	degrees [1]	169:19	77:11	125:8	125:15	80:11 81:18	152:10		196:5	215:6
169:8	122.10	delayed [1]	142:13	depend	ent m	30:8	177:20		Directo	10:7	2:4 10:10
dealt [4] 16:11	65:5	<b>deliberate</b> [2] 79:4	4:25	76:2	110:12	50.0	development [		10:13	17:1	17:7
154:10 158:8		deliberately [1]	140-24	depend		5:9	12:22 29:4 67:5 73:7	50:20 138:17	22:10	22:14	23:8
debate [3]	13:8	deliberation [1		24:2	37:9	145:11	150:10 152:1	162:11	24:10	24:13	24:17
164:18 167:20		deliberations		145:12			162:12 162:16		24:23	26:19	26:23 46:4
debris [1]	173:5	49:15 138:14		deplete		32:3	190:14	_	43:7 66:2	44:9 72:15	46:4 79:24
debt[1] 204:23		167:12 210:5	100.17	depleti		32:22	developmenta	<b>l</b> [1]	81:9	82:6	84:3
decades [4]	103:16	delicate [2]	115:10	depleti			151:15		86:1	91:15	91:19
103:18 169:2	179:16	192:16		DEPOS		<b>J</b> [2]	developments	[2]	92:3	92:14	95:11
December [2]	113:3	delineating [1]	169:4	1:23	218:22		179:25 180:1	20.10	109:23	110:2 154:13	122:8 155:14
182:23	77.61	deliver [2]	6:21	depth [		67:4	devise [3] 51:13 194:17	38:18	156:5	156:10	
decide [4] 97:8 120:1	77:21 164:23	39:12		derive		77:9	devised [1]	76:3	158:4	162:21	163:15
decided [1]	203:23	delivered [1]	69:8	derived		183:13	devoting [1]	70.3 198:15	177:3		199:10
	203.23	delivering [2]	58:23	describ	<b>e</b> [1]	92:5	do tomig [1]	170.13	199:18	210:6	216:18
DODELY 77 0	4.000	CIATES DE			202				1		v Daga 7

<b>BDAC MEETING</b>		CondenseIt <sup>™</sup>		directs - emerg
directs [3] 122:5	214:23	148:6 178:2	easements [5] 91:10	35:24 36:3 36:9
122:7 132:12	districts [6] 35:15	draft [10] 9:24	91:12 91:16 91:21	36:12 36:15 36:16
disagree [1] 121:24	115:18 211:15 211:21	16:18 47:23 57:7	92:1	36:23 37:2 37:6
disagreeing [1] 40:23	213:19 213:20	95:19 95:20 196:22 201:10 201:12 201:15	easier [3] 24:6 119:15 200:20	37:23 38:12 38:19 42:5 42:11 42:12
disagreement [2]	diverse [1] 87:3			42:24 43:16 43:20
87:19 164:13	diversion [14] 15:11 19:3 20:1 22:20	drag [1] 115:20 drain [6] 117:13 172:5	East [3] 1:24 3:4 218:22	44:3 44:18 48:14
disappeared [1] 164:17	19:3 20:1 22:20 33:22 34:2 34:6	172:9 173:11 173:13	easy[1] 116:20	48:21 48:25 56:11
disclosure [1] 53:23	49:4 49:14 52:15	173:17	eat [1] 193:15	64:16 64:22 77:10 92:25 93:2 93:18
disconnect [1] 99:17	54:21 54:23 61:5	drainage [13] 27:15	echo[1] 141:14	93:25 102:25 103:22
discreet [1] 209:21	64:2	27:16 27:17 28:5	echoed [1] 98:2	125:6 125:7 125:12
discuss [9] 8:19	diversions [15] 18:6	28:6 28:7 77:14	echoing [1] 131:17	125:16 125:19 142:24
33:12 54:10 79:8 80:3 87:18 90:25	21:3 30:4 30:13 33:16 33:20 36:17	80:7 92:22 164:13 164:15 180:21 181:7	eco[1] 98:17	155:21 155:24 156:1 160:7 163:4 185:12
150:24 201:8	50:5 52:13 55:13	dramatic [3] 24:5	ecological [2] 29:24	190:11 195:16 200:5
discussed [23] 17:22	63:12 64:10 65:1	31:24 149:15	97:16	efficient [7] 31:7
24:1 35:2 43:6	116:2 173:2	drastically [1] 172:7	economic [5] 2:5	36:24 37:24 41:6
43:17 50:3 51:21	diverted [1] 36:22	dredging [2] 21:12	44:15 81:19 183:13	42:14 55:13 65:6
72:19 91:16 120:15 120:16 142:18 182:21	<b>diverter</b> [1] 55:21	22:19	192:21	efficiently [3] 36:20
184:12 203:15 206:17	<b>diverting</b> [1] 55:17	<b>dribble</b> [1] 167:17	economical [1] 178:15	40:2 48:20
207:15 213:4 213:5	<b>DMC</b> [1] 77:5	drink [2] 25:10	economics [1] 123:10	effort [23] 8:5 16:19 31:14 50:13
213:7 213:10 213:14	document [2] 147:13	191:3	ecosystem [73] 12:3	16:19 31:14 50:13 52:20 53:21 56:18
214:20	182:6	drinking [7] 25:5	14:5 18:16 20:11	116:3 128:8 133:7
discussing [5] 67:10	documentation [4]	25:6 25:19 59:6	20:15 22:4 23:23 24:5 26:13 27:9	135:2 135:5 139:13
84:4 86:3 93:25 159:11	12:18 50:11 62:7 199:24	60:7 65:11 191:5	29:10 29:12 29:18	139:24 140:3 157:10
discussion [49] 5:10	documents [4] 6:15	drive [1] 43:24	31:1 31:7 31:8	163:21 164:14 167:7 188:14 195:12 198:8
26:17 31:18 33:7	62:2 138:16 138:18	driver's [1] 211:18	49:21 50:1 50:8	210:4
44:24 49:1 50:18	doesn't [15] 33:9	driving [2] 43:20 123:10	63:7 63:20 80:18 82:11 82:12 83:2	efforts [11] 28:2
65:13 67:4 67:15	45:23 45:24 60:19	drop [2] 143:8 155:25	89:1 89:7 91:17	31:6 50:14 75:16
67:22 68:13 74:9 77:16 82:21 83:24	88:6 105:14 112:11	dropped [4] 45:1	99:24 100:6 100:24	98:6 110:18 148:1
92:18 96:24 99:16	124:16 148:15 155:22	160:3 160:11 196:17	109:4 110:9 118:24	157:2 167:21 215:2
103:25 106:10 119:6	172:20 172:22 197:14 203:17 203:18	drops [1] 20:23	119:10 120:3 142:12	215:18
119:7 119:13 126:21	dog [1] 190:10	drought [14] 39:22	145:20 145:22 147:20 147:24 148:13 148:16	eggs [5] 33:10 33:14 33:17 34:3 34:5
136:23 138:24 141:13	dollar [3] 157:12	41:12 93:15 94:9	148:21 148:21 149:7	EIR [2] 15:20 199:25
156:2 158:22 161:2 168:25 170:3 184:11	159:3 159:4	96:3 96:6 96:12	153:24 158:20 163:1	EIR/EIS [4] 15:20
186:23 196:12 197:12	dollars [1] 214:24	96:13 104:6 104:6	163:1 168:15 170:16	83:20 162:23 163:25
199:20 208:4 208:8	Don [3] 2:16 91:5	122:21 123:6 175:25 176:3	182:1 182:2 183:5 185:9 190:11 195:3	EIS [5] 15:21 81:25
208:8 209:2 209:16	108:12	dry[1] 176:6	195:5 195:8 195:10	162:18 163:13 199:25
210:12 210:16 210:19 211:2 212:9 212:15	done [29] 8:17	Du [2] 180:17 180:17	195:17 200:6 201:10	EIS's [1] 76:17
discussions [20]	17:10 29:16 33:12	dual [13] 15:13 19:21	204:25 207:12 207:17	either [12] 38:10
8:3 9:20 26:7	41:16 75:12 79:1 81:2 85:1 101:17	23:10 39:11 43:2	207:20 208:1 208:7 208:10 209:11 210:3	44:19 57:18 61:7
35:22 47:18 47:23	101:19 103:21 110:10	53:1 53:11 58:18	Ed[1] 116:14	63:4 87:3 87:18 94:11 141:5 142:15
48:15 49:2 49:6	113:6 117:2 117:20	59:2 59:3 88:15	EDF <sub>[2]</sub> 98:10 98:24	158:7 165:3
49:16 51:2 51:20 81:24 118:19 125:25	128:18 129:1 129:15	138:17 204:10	Edison [1] 3:14	elaborate [2] 87:5
166:24 195:21 197:10	161:17 161:18 162:20 188:11 190:1 190:2	due [2] 75:23 183:14	educate [1] 214:6	195:24
207:23 213:11	190:16 190:21 192:21	Dues [1] 211:1	education [3] 213:13	element [6] 28:14
disease [1] 192;2	195:25	<b>Dunn</b> [2] 175:5	213:18 213:18	28:20 145:10 175:14
disparate [1] 8:7	dotted [1] 207:2	Dunning [2] 108:23	educational [1] 17:23	176:21 198:13
display [2] 53:12	doubt[1] 107:9	215:24	effect [3] 96:10	elements [13] 28:13 29:2 38:5 100:10
53:20	doubts [1] 90:24	during [19] 18:5	112:10 204:13	146:11 146:12 146:14
displayed [1] 53:22	down [29] 10:24	30:15 33:16 35:7	effective [6] 131:24	148:5 155:20 156:9
<b>disputing</b> [1] 39:19	17:17 32:14 55:15	39:16 47:6 94:8	166:8 167:15 203:19	156:11 175:6 195:8
disruptive [1] 79:15	61:3 61:20 73:4	96:13 109:11 114:20	209:10 211:12	elevation[1] 177:7
dissolved [1] 172:23	76:6 83:19 94:8 94:9 94:15 95:10	122:21 123:6 128:14 135:20 140:17 142:2	effectiveness [2]	elicited [1] 135:14
distinct [4] 32:9	97:1 97:11 97:12	176:5 176:6 199:20	158:2 159:1	<b>eliminate</b> [1] 179:1
33:16 44:15 164:4	113:1 115:21 160:21	dynamic [1] 150:9	<b>effects</b> [3] 97:16 97:17 106:21	Elk[1] 191:2
distributed [1] 97:7	169:23 172:19 172:20	early [6] 11:17 48:8	efficiencies [4] 101:24	elsewhere [1] 38:8
district [17] 2:9	172:21 173:5 179:1 187:17 193:18 197:11	138:23 139:3 158:6	104:12 214:3 214:4	Elson [1] 139:12
2:16 2:19 3:5 3:14 92:12 95:22	218:6	159:12	efficiency [61] 14:7	embark [1] 139:12
95:23 96:4 123:25		earth[3] 114:24 115:11	20:11 23:23 26:7	embodied [1] 43:21
177:4 181:21 188:9	downstream [6] 22:22	115:13	27:10 34:11 34:12	embrace [1] 42:4
196:5 196:10 214:22	30:14 32:17 33:17	easement [2] 92:7	34:14 34:19 35:1	emerged [2] 135:5
	30.11 32.17 33.17	92:12	35:12 35:20 35:22	omorgou (z) 155.5

BDAC MEETING	ł	CondenseIt <sup>™</sup>	em	ergencies - fallowing
139:11	ensuring [2] 167:6	172:22 182:22 182:24	81:9 82:6 84:3	184:20 207:22
emergencies [1]	167:7	182:25 183:19	86:1 91:15 91:19	extensive [5] 15:1
28:16	enter [2] 95:21 95:22	estuary's [1] 183:14	92:3 92:14 95:11	73:9 73:11 161:11
emergency [4] 28:14	enthusiasm[1] 211:5	et [3] 79:5 121:7	109:23 110:2 122:8 126:24 154:13 155:14	184:21
28:17 28:18 28:19	<b>entire</b> [3] 61:7	211:25	156:5 156:10 156:14	extensively [1] 189:13
emphasis [5] 100:5	184:4 188:18	ethic [3] 42:4 213:15	158:4 162:21 163:15	<b>extent</b> [5] 26:12
100:9 143:10 146:2	entirely [3] 45:11	215:18	183:23 198:24 199:10	65:9 71:11 85:2
161:7	114:23 166:13	evaded [1] 152:20	199:18 216:6 216:18	163:6
emphasize [5] 8:25	entities [1] 172:16	evaluate [2] 164:2	exercise [1] 13:1	externally[1] 48:16
67:14 81:22 130:9	entitled [2] 97:24	175:13	existing [23] 15:10	extra [2] 120:4 188:14
195:10	122:20	evaluated [1] 163:18	15:11 19:2 19:3	extraction [3] 30:22
empirically [1] 37:13	entitlement [1] 181:23	evaluation [6] 23:12	20:1 20:2 21:3	31:25 32:5
employees [1] 94:12	entity [3] 162:14	23:18 48:9 145:7	21:3 21:4 21:12	extraordinary [1]
empowered [1] 71:8	163:14 166:16	200:1 211:10	22:19 30:22 39:10 50:5 52:16 53:5	96:12
encompass [1] 71:24	entrainment [2] 33:10	evaporate[1] 76:24	53:6 53:14 66:12	<b>extremely</b> [1] 144:15
encompasses [2]	33:14	evaporates [1] 76:25	122:3 151:15 151:20	eye [1] 152:22
27:12 27:15	entrance[1] 32:12	evaporation [1] 80:7	202:24	face [2] 116:17 116:18
encounters [2] 54:24		evenings [1] 5:7	exists [2] 71:13	facet [1] 45:6
55:1	environment [10]	everybody [9] 11:16	122:9	facilitate [1] 78:12
encourage [3] 149:1	1 18:4 18:7 40:15	66:3 86:10 89:23	expand [3] 132:1	facilities [19] 28:8
161:3 161:23	99:2 114:17 124:12	111:16 153:13 157:22	151:5 151:6	41:3 42:15 42:16
encouraged [2] 5:12	144:8 145:19 183:25	197:4 203:11	expansion [1] 135:19	52:10 52:14 52:18
145:18	198:9	everybody's [1]	1 -	53:11 53:21 54:15
encouraging [1]	environmental [38]	11:14	expect [11] 4:22 36:11 42:3 56:2	76:1 111:14 146:3
211:3	2:21 12:17 36:16	evidence [2] 8:13	86:25 96:5 96:6	146:24 147:8 178:20
end[17] 5:15 5:25	36:22 40:17 77:2	77:10	96:7 96:8 196:9	180:5 180:11 180:12
6:11 8:2 10:20	77:23 82:10 85:16	evolution [1] 158:16	206:2	facility [21] 15:15
21:18 22:18 22:19	98:11 114:14 120:11	evolved[1] 154:25	expectation [3] 36:19	23:15 43:2 45:7
24:25 70:23 72:1	123:4 127:22 129:11 131:11 133:19 134:1	evolving [5] 9:19	126:5 129:10	53:1 53:3 53:10
76:20 77:12 100:1	~   ~	93:6 93:9 147:15	expected [1] 150:10	54:23 58:19 59:2
102:15 200:17 201:1	145:17 146:4 146:6	149:17	expecting [2] 44:3	59:3 59:20 61:6 67:10 67:25 74:10
endangered [3] 113:2	147:22 150:22 152:15	exact[1]136:12	165:25	88:15 147:3 147:10
114:17 152:12	164:21 168:5 175:17	1 2 7	expenditures [2]	178:18 178:21
endeavor[1] 31:9	180:9 196:17 198:16	exactly [11] 25:14 26:22 36:2 41:8	168:1 184:18	facing [2] 111:11
endeavored [1] 29:22	208:1 211:1 211:16	47:10 51:14 61:17	<b>expense</b> [2] 12:9	198:18
<b>ended</b> [1] 15:9	213:8 216:9	61:20 112:17 168:7	123:12	fact [35] 7:17 11:14
ending [1] 17:13	environmentalist [1]	202:13	expenses [1] 204:20	23:2 34:4 52:20
endorse [3] 153:2	4   114:13	examination [2]	expensive [3] 55:12	57:6 61:3 80:4
167:18 169:7	environmentally [1]	109:2 155:12	55:22 161:17	88:8 88:17 89:22
endorsed[1] 132:2	1 150:15	example [15] 30:9	experience [4] 64:25	90:6 90:14 96:22
endorsement [1]	equates [1] 25:4	37:25 56:8 56:15	76:16 121:18 213:17	109:3 114:19 114:21
98:14	equation [2] 120:20	76:22 85:12 90:1	experimental [2]	127:6 127:16 127:23 142:12 146:5 151:16
energized[1] 57:17	180:13	97:10 105:3 139:16	49:5 49:14	152:14 154:19 160:18
enforce [1] 213:9	<b>Eric</b> [4] 2:6 156:15	162:18 167:25 205:22	<b>expertise</b> [2] 100:22	163:9 175:7 189:13
enforceable [1] 76:4	202:2 207:5	212:25 213:25	168:23	204:6 211:5 211:17
	Eric's [1] 195:7	examples [5] 64:6	explain [3] 37:11	212:13 213:14 213:19
enforcement [2] 212:13 213:2	error [1] 42:10	77:18 80:16 112:1 162:25	44:21 56:17	factor[1] 199:8
	especially [10] 28:24	exceeds [1] 190:15	explanation [2] 9:16	factors [1] 130:3
engage [1] 166:2	<sup>3</sup>   30:17 40:14 138:21		77:2	failure [3] 78:8
engaged[1] 57:1:	170.21 270.20 270.00	<b>except</b> [4] 97:14 117:19 155:24 188:12	explication [1] 37:5	149:16 183:18
engineering [1] 65:4	177:7 179:5 185:15		explicitly [1] 43:17	faintest [1] 198:11
Engineers [2] 190:		<b>excess</b> [3] 68:5 68:6 178:7	explore [1] 149:19	fair [4] 4:22 48:8
190:20	essential [3] 66:25		export [6] 20:5	87:2 154:21
<b>enhance</b> [1] 28:9	67:3 77:24	excited [1] 31:14	38:7 39:12 66:7	Fairfax [1] 173:3
enhancement [1]	essentially [10] 17:11	exciting [1] 150:8	77:12 124:15	fairly [13] 10:22
135:19	17:25 30:21 33:15	<b>exclusion</b> [1] 198:3	exported [4] 77:9	50:16 57:14 67:1
enhances [1] 100:	1 00.12 154.24 196.11	exclusive [1] 92:23	78:12 106:20 159:24	86:24 87:3 132:8
enlarging [1] 177:	98:13 154:24 186:11	<b>Excuse</b> [1] 170:10	exporters [1] 124:11	139:1 139:2 158:14
enlightening [1]	establish[1] 138:6	Executive [49] 2:4	exports [6] 37:14	178:10 203:6 209:21
9:17	established [2] 103:10	7:23 10:7 10:10	63:17 113:3 125:8	faithfully [1] 135:25
enormous [3] 97:14	148:9	10:13 17:1 17:7	125:15 125:20	fall [1] 111:10
129:3 209:8	establishing [2] 69:21	22:10 22:14 23:8	exposure[1] 201:20	fallacious [1] 94:14
ensure [7] 34:2		24:10 24:13 24:17 24:23 26:19 26:23	L .	fallowing [10] 35:17
102:22 105:16 110:	9 establishment[1]	24:23 26:19 26:23 43:7 44:9 46:4	_ <del>-</del> -	92:10 93:8 93:10
167:16 179:15 180:		66:2 72:15 79:24	<b>expressed</b> [6] 52:4 58:12 137:6 149:21	93:14 93:21 93:22
	estuary [6] 30:1		30.12 137.0 177.21	
DODTALE & AC	SOCIATES DEPOSI	TON DEDODTEDS		Index Page 9

BDAC MEE	ring_			Conden	seIt <sup>™</sup>		famili	ar - fu <u>ll</u>	
93:23 96:5	143:24	203:25 214:6		fish [33] 22:21	22:25		172:12	8:11 16:4	21:25
familiar [1]	10:17	ferret [1]	9:7	32:7 32:17 50:2 50:4	49:25 50:7	173:1 173:14 174:6 174:10		50:16 58:5 72:12 87:13	68:11 88:1
Family [2]	2:22	feverishly [1]	130:17	51:5 52:5	50:7 52:10	179:2 183:9	174:13	88:3 88:6	88:9
122:18		few [15] 49:17	57:22	54:10 54:19	54:24	flush [4] 32:23	58:11	89:22 89:23	90:6
far [24] 62:1	62:3	68:17 127:10 154:18 154:19		55:1 55:5	55:5	91:2 174:11	00.11	90:15 90:23	119:7
63:19 75:13 107:14 131:10	106:16 132:6	175:11 176:10		55:7 55:22 64:1 64:14	56:1 64:22	flushed [1]	212:8	122:13 137:2	142:16
132:20 151:19			205:25	64:1 64:14 65:1 65:6	97:11	focus [13]	18:6	148:10 163:20 166:2 186:9	163:23 200:23
156:18 157:12	157:23	209:19		116:1 172:8	173:20	18:9 30:2	30:13	fostering [1]	162:4
158:1 169:3 179:24 184:24	179:3	fewer[3]	34:2	174:14 174:23	174:25	42:7 42:18	68:20	found [4]	9:16
188:12 190:15		44:17 44:18		183:20		128:4 138:17 184:17 195:1	154:22 199:23	62:1 63:13	103:12
209:8	171.7	fifth[1] 74:4		fisheries [9]	33:8	focused [11]	8:23	foundation [1]	72:7
farm [4] 2:20	115:25	fight [1] 174:1		52:9 59:16 59:22 63:13	59:18 81:20	8:23 11:8	52:1	four [26] 19:8	19:19
180:18 203:11		figure [5]	36:2	110:14 209:1	01.20	53:9 71:25	76:6	22:3 27:1	34:10
farmer [6]	95:13	38:14 84:17 205:18	188:20	Fishermen's	1]	96:11 131:8	167:6	68:14 73:10	77:3
114:12 114:14	114:20	figured [1]	207:3	2:24		210:19	110.10	119:18 127:18 156:21 156:23	
116:10 190:9	0.00	figures [1]	204:19	fishery [3]	33:8	focusing [2] 158:19	119:10	158:10 158:11	
farmers [10] 106:24 111:1	2:23 113:22	figuring [2]	85:22	55:8 208:17		FOLEY [5]	2:9	174:15 184:18	184:25
115:22 115:23		166:19	00.22	fishes [3]	34:5	60:11 186:20	216:22	185:5 186:1	186:10
191:11 192:4	192:14	file[1] 87:17		34:5 64:8 <b>fishing</b> [3]	0.11	217:1		186:17 207:16	
farming [2]	106:24	files [1] 65:16		11 <b>sning</b> [3]	9:11	Foley's [1]	216:21	fourth [5] 36:14 73:22	35:4 209:2
190:13		fill [2] 5:4	75:7	fit [6] 24:2	80:14	folks [12]	11:1	215:23	207.2
farms [2]	174:19	filled [3]	5:19	93:20 93:22	112:4	47:15 49:8	100:17	fragile [1]	192:10
181:13	150.05	114:7 202:21		119:18		108:12 116:4 147:2 147:16	134:8 147:17	fragments [1]	148:20
farther [1]	153:25	final [9] 9:24	55:20	fits [2] 36:3	45:3	149:21 166:1	117.17	frame [2]	5:18
fascinated [1]		146:25 147:1	147:1	five [18] 5:17	17:15	follow [2]	57:11	68:23	
fashion [5] 63:18 73:21	58:13 74:2	147:19 155:12 201:15	102:18	24:24 25:3	56:8	66:22		framed [2]	72:17
122:10	7-1.2	finally [5]	35:19	56:15 72:16 159:3 167:23	74:18 169:18	follow-up [4]	39:6	86:2	
fast[1] 9:19		38:12 130:25		174:15 177:25		42:21 156:17	165:18	framework [2]	212:1
faster[1]	198:6	213:23		180:3 194:22	198:18	followed [1]	21:16	212:3	50.0
fauna [1]	114:25	finance [15]	153:3	209:24		following [3]	4:1	framing [4] 61:18 68:14	58:9 71:20
favorable [1]	141:8	157:8 187:14		fix[1] 113:6		126:15 202:6	100.0	Francisco [7]	2:13
favorably [2]	91:25	195:15 197:10 201:17 202:3	200:13	fixing [1]	12:1	follows [1] Fonzie [1]	103:3	30:16 132:22	
134:14		203:23 204:6	205:17	flag[1] 113:18			76:21	177:14 182:8	182:24
feasibility [2]	79:5	205:24 206:22		flashing [1]	136:24	food [2] 191:19	191:23	frankly [5]	31:14
176:20		finances [1]	161:2	Flat [3] 45:16	45:17	foot [2] 173:4	177:7	100:4 100:21	100:25
feasible [1]	175:21	financial [5]	16:3	45:19		force [1] 133:6	41.0	166:16	
February [1]	147:9	161:10 200:11	200:12	flesh [1] 173:22		forecast [1]	41:2	freak [1] 114:14	00.15
Federal [15]	3:6	207:4	1100	flexibility [8]	35:23 44:10	foregoing [1]	218:10	freaks [1]	98:17
11:11 71:5 133:13 134:25	133:7	financing [5] 153:2 196:1	112:2 200:21	44:17 63:15	107:2	forest [1]	191:2	free [7] 7:12 96:15 96:22	96:1 98:24
147:11 152:12		203:8	200.21	168:10		forget [1]	163:10	115:13 215:12	70.27
202:15 202:15		findings [1]	206:1	flexible [4]	44:14	forgot [1]	205:19	frees [1] 215:12	
202:24 213:1		fine [4] 109:19		212:1 212:19		<b>form</b> [5] 6:11 93:11 201:1	14:10 214:2	fresh [2] 26:3	137:18
Federation [1]		117:16 135:7		flood [5] 29:6 32:17	28:24	formal [1]	87:17	freshwater [3]	
fee [6] 195:9	195:23	fine-tune[1]	63:9	29:6 32:17 45:25	45:15	format [1]	189:6	160:1 160:5	
196:9 196:16 197:20	197:1	fine-tuned[1]	63:21	flooded [1]	76:23	formation [1]	18:21	Friant [3]	3:13
feed [3] 16:15	30:1	finessing [1]	100:10	floor [2] 37:24	212:21	formed [3]	14:8	45:13 95:23	
187:4	20.1	finished [1]	136:16	flora [1] 114:24		129:5 216:7		FRICK [2]	3:13
feedback [5]	105:25	Firebaugh [1]	3:8	flow [17]	18:1	forms [1]	144:7	110:25   <b>Friday</b> [3]	1:14
106:1 187:1	197:8	firm [1] 78:20		23:12 26:11	32:8	formula [1]	122:6	4:9 6:3	1.14
201:8	<b>**</b> **	firmly [1]	76:14	33:3 37:14	59:19	forth [9] 38:3	59:23	friendly [2]	23:1
feeling [2] 96:19	75:3	first [32] 11:10	13:7	61:7 77:6 95:3 97:13	94:25 97:14	113:13 113:14		95:18	
fees [5] 195:21	196:4	14:16 14:24 52:2 55:12	17:22 72:4	145:22 163:23		140:21 161:8 192:22	169:7	front [6] 4:16	8:2
196:5 203:14		72:22 79:7	99:11	204:22		forthright [1]	211:12		151:18
feet [11] 24:11	54:21	99:12 106:4	118:5	flowing [2]	59:14	forthrightly [1]		170:17	
60:17 65:2	65:16	135:14 136:24		59:25		forum [4]	2:5	fruit [1] 192:1	110.12
94:19 178:6	178:19	154:11 154:16 159:3 163:10		flows [24]	15:13	119:22 164:22	201:4	frustration[1]	
181:22 205:4	214:25	178:4 179:8	177:25 180:8	18:9 24:6 26:3 30:14	24:25 32:17	forums [2]	120:16	fulfilled[1]	71:17
<b>felt</b> [10] 47:2 56:21 133:17	49:8	201:9 203:21		26:3 30:14 32:22 68:5	68:6	196:22		<b>full</b> [13] 20:5 20:8 24:15	20:6 50:20
	137:7 175:24		212:11	106:19 110:14		forward [28]	7:16	53:4 53:11	50:20
		OI A TEO DE				<u> </u>			D 10

BDAC MEET	TING			Co	ndense	eIt™			fully -	- hereby
53:24 67:9	166:23	96:25 115:12	117:21	115:1	115:1	154:3	103:14 191:16	198:6	116:9 116:9	190:8
218:10 218:11		glad [4] 143:24	168:13		154:7	166:13	growing [1]	198:5	190:8 193:2	
fully [3] 142:14	211:12	193:23 216:15		167:22 179:10		176:2	growth [1]	78:5	HASSELTIN	
212:7	155.00		19:9	greater		30:16	guarantee [1]	61:16	2:6 75:6 202:3 205:14	156:16
function [2] 155:21	155:20	Glenn-Colusa	[1]		38:2	104:10	guarantees [5]	50:24	hat [1] 129:2	
functions [3]	18:17	2:16	150 11	147:10			51:2 55:21	200:15	hate [2] 152:8	168:5
29:24 33:7	10.17	C	150:11	greatest	[3]	127:2	209:13		haul [1] 169:14	108:3
fund [2] 2:21	163:2	10	199:2	183:13			guess [29] 22:18 25:13	17:4 27:4	_	F.C
fundamental re			208:17	greatly	[1]	107:6	22:18 25:13 39:18 40:4	40:14	haunt [1]	5:6
13:19 18:3	66:5	God [1] 115:2		green [1]		136:24	56:6 56:16	57:20	head [2] 99:22	135:1
95:25 96:14	124:8		42:22	grew [1]	190:25		59:4 59:12	65:10	headed [5] 84:20 99:18	9:13 100:19
funding [8]	28:17		65:14 172:17	groan [1]	l	209:8	68:7 70:16	81:23	126:10	100.19
28:21 29:3 196:1 202:23	168:25 203:1	172:19 178:2	179:9	ground		4:24	84:17 87:24 97:24 108:25	93:17 122:2	heading [2]	115:7
203:3	203:1	golden [2]	2:24	1	65:3	80:19	125:21 133:11	156:18	193:4	
funds [3]	133:7	9:25		154:21			186:15 190:1	199:11	health [2]	148:16
202:15 202:25	200.,	golf [2] 96:8	97:1	groundy 19:7	<b>valiči</b> (1 20:10	23:22	204:16		208:13	
fungi [1]	192:13		128:20		176:1	176:6	guide [1]	10:1	healthier [1]	142:12
furthermore [2]	78:22	135:22 161:22	190:19	176:12	176:21	177:8	guiding [2]	170:12	healthy [6]	115:8
178:2		193:12	4.4	177:19			170:21		183:19 192:18 208:9 211:22	192:22
future [4]	56:3		4:4 12:16	group [9:		29:16	guts[1] 173:23	EC. E	hear [15] 8:15	10:7
100:1 198:6	199:3	I.	36:22		36:12 52:21	48:20 69:23	<b>guy</b> [7] 2:20 57:5 57:12	56:5 89:13	57:21 58:25	72:21
fuzzy [1]	12:15	49:8 64:6	67:19		71:4	71:6	175:9 188:2	07.13	96:25 98:12	125:23
gadgets [1]	55:12		75:12	71:10	71:13	71:18	guys [5] 12:15	106:7	125:24 143:25	
Game [1]	55:7	80:17 82:23 90:17 103:19	86:2		72:19	73:24	131:22 154:14	217:10	160:2 184:3 190:17	190:10
gap [1] 149:23			123:21		75:20 81:25	75:21 86:24	habitat [24]	21:15	heard [25]	35:7
Gary [12]	82:15	129:17 129:19	130:4		87:16	87:18	22:25 23:3	29:21	52:2 83:1	90:19
133:20 136:7 141:3 141:6	136:11 141:9		148:5		89:19	90:14	29:23 30:3 30:12 30:12	30:7 30:24	91:8 98:2	98:16
151:1 151:2	155:19	148:6 154:6 155:6 164:20	155:5		96:1	103:22	31:5 31:5	63:19	108:7 108:10	114:8
156:12 196:14		176:7 178:25			105:13 108:24	108:3 108:25	84:8 91:25	91:25	124:6 134:4 138:5 138:20	138:3
Gate [1] 2:24		184:2 185:19			108.24	112:8	148:2 149:22		154:15 171:19	179:8
gee [1] 171:11		191:19 191:23		112:18		123:2	150:13 150:18 171:10 184:1	158:21	182:2 182:19	
general [27]	4:20	205:16 211:10 217:11	214:11		148:10	151:5	habitats [4]	29:25	185:11 217:6	217:9
23:16 27:11	31:12	Government [2]		151:10 156:3	153:3 157:8	153:16 165:2	63:8 148:19	148:23	hearing [7]	108:22
32:9 32:17 80:20 80:21	75:3 80:24	152:5 188:24	j.	165:11		165:25	half [4] 57:16	177:12	136:19 171:9 189:14 189:19	184:25 189:19
92:14 92:18	98:1	governmental	11	166:19	166:19	167:1	177:13 191:17		heart [3] 90:22	108:18
98:17 106:16	142:9	188:23				168:16	Hall [11] 2:7	104:18	117:1	100.10
146:8 187:5	193:4	Governor [3]	11:5	179:7 185:19	184:8	184:16	107:21 109:19		heartbeat [1]	115:10
202:7 205:1 206:8 206:19	206:6	71:6 128:17		187:14		195:14	121:22 127:9 132:24 133:17	127:14 197:11	heartburn [1]	126:1
207:20 213:18	200.21		99:4	195:15	195:16	197:10	hand [2] 99:9	152:20	heartily [2]	167:18
generalized [1]	62:3	1 -	32:13			203:23	handle [1]	54:6	180:8	
generally [5]	16:1		157:2		206:1 207:2	206:19 207:12	handled [1]	185:21	heat [1] 172:3	
47:25 98:25	125:1		2:21	207:22			hanging [1]	157:21	heavily [1]	202:14
161:16			24:15 59:7	210:11	210:14	211:8	Hap [2] 108:23	215:24	heavy [1]	192:6
generate [3]	81:17		97:24			216:10	happening [3]	43:24	held [3] 16:8	70:11
86:9 196:2	10.5	98:20 127:10	131:3	216:10		166.17	96:6 119:23	TJ,47	164:14	
generated [4] 13:11 42:12	13:5 201:2		162:10	group's		166:17	happy [5]	34:22	help [13] 34:20	41:21
generating [1]	13:1		165:13	groupin 84:13	g [2]	78:17	127:19 135:4	153:2	51:13 65:18 122:23 133:9	116:1 141:17
generic [4]	110:8		17:4	groups	3.41	75:19	216:25		172:22 178:5	184:17
160:1 160:8	162:10	granite [1]	32:14		86:5	112:10	harass [1]	5:7	196:8 197:5	
gentleman [1]	202:12	granted [1]	45:21	127:24	128:1	128:7	hard [13] 8:11	8:16	helped [3]	10:1
geographic [2]		graphic [1]	17:16			186:23	20:14 36:8 71:17 127:4	56:6 130:23	98:11 161:4	
194:9		grasp[1]	65:25	187:2 189:12	188:23 189:17	189:11 190:5	130:25 133:20	167:6	helpful [11]	5:7
George [1]	123:15		174:11		194:9	194:15	167:8 185:13		5:23 6:15 135:10 161:5	121:4 184:15
germane [1]	207:23	gravel [4] 31:25 32:2	30:22 32:5	194:15	195:19	197:8	harden [1]	39:14	185:20 197:25	208:23
giant [1] 172:13		gravels [1]	30:5	197:16		201:25	hardening [2]	41:16	214:8	
gist[1] 185:17		gravers [1]	62:1	211:1	211:16	211:18 213:8	41:19		helping [1]	145:4
given [7]	8:10	grazing [1]	84:10	211:21		216:14	hardest [2]	88:24	helps [2] 65:17	66:19
19:12 46:1	66:10	great [15]	41:13	Grove [1		191:2	89:5		herbicides [1]	28:4
78:17 109:2	154:20	45:22 79:1	100:25	grow [5]			Harmony [1]	115:7	hereby [1]	218:4
giving [4]	57:23			رق د عق			Harter [6]	114:10	_	
		CY A COURT DEED					-		•	

53:23

79:5

81:19

85:12

99:1

55:14

81:19

97:6

99:1

123:4

80:5

53:20

76:19

81:13

84:23

97:15

99:1

3:13

112:19

33:21

Howard [3]

hundred [4]

110:24 113:21

huge [2] 104:7

V.

Index Page 12

117:19 121:3

187:20 187:22 200:25

166:18

209:23

191:24

112.4

insect [1]

121:14 154:9

201:20 208:6

200:3

213:24

209:9

importantly [1] 123:1

impressed [1] 114:11

impression [1] 64:22

212:5

42:11

100:1

144:19

increases [1]

increasing [7]

110:16

100:15

177:2

142:11

40:2

39:16

206:3

104:25

BDAC MEET	ring			Co	ndense	eIt™			insects	- Lake
insects [1]	192:2	interpreted [1]	95:18	60:12	61:25	69:7	32:11 33:2	45:13	9:12 9:14	9:15
inside [1]	55:18	interpreting [1]	96:15	73:3	73:6	73:16	46:10 46:14	77:4	9:18 10:21	10:24
insights [1]	71:11		152:2	73:22 80:5	74:19 84:25	80:3 88:20	77:15 91:20 94:25 97:10	94:20 111:1	11:7 11:9 11:23 12:6	11:9 12:22
instance [1]	214:23	interrelations [		91:11	91:14	92:15	146:15 172:15		13:3 14:11	14:22
instances [1]	69:2	79:5 140:21		93:5	93:14	95:12	174:14 178:22		15:18 16:6	16:15
instead [4]	7:10	interrelationsh	ips [1]	95:25	96:3	96:14	181:15 218:2	218:17	18:16 18:22	19:15
95:2 97:11	97:12	24:7	126.5	97:6 102:25	101:15	102:4 113:20	job [10] 50:12	79:1	20:15 20:20 20:25 21:12	20:21 21:17
institute [2] 188:24	141:10	1	136:5	120:15		134:24	79:18 103:21 117:16 131:7	117:2 135:11	21:21 22:18	23:4
institutional [1	01	I	149:6 177:3		136:12		203:17 214:12	100.11	24:2 24:25	25:5
16:3 67:6	146:9	introduced [2]		142:18	142:19	142:21 158:5	<b>join</b> [1] 7:9		34:22 34:23 54:4 59:23	44:25 61:18
163:23 165:12		182:21	142.21		163:17		joined [1]	85:2	61:20 67:6	69:3
166:21 200:15	200:22	introduction [1]		164:13	165:10	166:12	<b>joke</b> [1] 79:22		72:22 72:24	73:6
209:12	165.4	183:15		194:25		199:19	Jones [2]	98:10	73:15 74:6	74:11
institutions [1]			172:21	200:3 216:4	201:6 216:9	210:15	98:17		74:21 75:3 80:7 80:15	76:17 81:12
instream [s] 30:14 110:20	18:9 177:10	intuitively [1]	68:3	issues		5:1	judgment[1]	155:13	81:14 81:17	81:20
177:20	1,,,10		182:25	6:24	7:13	8:23	judgments [1]	85:4	84:13 85:2	85:5
instructive [1]	198:20	invasion[1]	182:7	11:10	11:20	11:22	Judith [8] 82:8 82:19	2:22	85:16 86:12	98:2
intakes [1]	54:22		112:13	14:13 43:10	16:3 43:20	28:19 47:5	82:8 82:19 157:5 160:15	104:18 210:10	98:22 104:20 112:23 113:18	
integrate [3]	50:13	I. — — —	213:22	43:10	50:15	50:19	214:20		127:4 130:18	133:5
195:13 195:18		investment [4]		51:17	51:21	52:12	Judith's [1]	98:21	133:14 134:10	
integrated [3]	35:25		159:4	54:2	54:7	54:19	Judy [2] 46:19	63:5	136:2 138:16 148:20 152:17	146:11 155:7
38:21 93:12	20.11	invitations [1]		55:3 60:7	55:25 65:23	58:1 70:5	Judy's [2]	52:3	157:21 158:25	
integrity [11] 20:21 22:5	20:11 23:24		121:2 189:2	70:7	70:10	70:12	54:7		164:5 164:13	164:22
28:12 31:22	32:9	1	5:16	71:19	74:5	74:7	July [8] 1:14	4:9	165:3 167:15	
32:16 82:13	147:21	188:13 209:25	5.10	74:12	74:15	80:1	6:22 87:10 128:14 202:4	114:18 218:5	171:13 187:2 191:14 195:9	190:9 198:21
149:8		involve [5]	83:25	80:4 80:25	80:19 81:10	80:22 84:4	jump [1] 15:17	210.5	198:22 199:21	
intend [5] 76:20 86:14	59:3 163:6	87:11 175:20	175:22	85:8	88:18	88:19	jumping [2]	125:4	200:1 205:22	209:17
201:19	103:0	208:16		92:22	98:23	100:19	161:1	120	213:3 213:11	
intended [5]	47:10		74:1 115:15	100:23	101:7 110:23	108:18 114:2	June [6] 16:9	117:3	kinds [26] 22:15 23:19	20:24 55:25
71:11 76:9	105:6		175:10	118:22		130:3	180:20 202:4	207:13	62:11 74:12	80:25
156:24		202:14 203:4		131:20	132:10	141:11	210:11	_	81:13 81:16	84:22
intends [2]	52:12	involvement [8]		143:13		144:11	justification [2 77:23 137:18	1	101:12 103:9	103:16
216:12	20.17		79:2		148:4 150:22	148:8 152:4	juvenile [2]	32:7	104:4 108:13 110:20 166:1	110:19 168:8
intensive [3] 62:7 128:13	20:17	134:3 186:18 194:6 210:1	193:4	153:3	165:11	171:10	54:24	32.7	197:7 198:12	
intent [5]	79:14	la =	30:10	194:16		197:7	K [1] 1:11		203:20 209:4	209:16
89:22 90:24	137:24	75:25 145:16	30.10	197:24	198:3 216:13	210:15	KAMEI [2]	2:18	213:1	
138:13		involving [1]	116:1	item [10]		36:14	87:24		Kings [2] 45:17	45:15
intention [2]	5:1		172:14	68:14	69:10	80:21	keep [20]	22:21	<b>kit</b> [1] 203:16	
intentions [1]	5.00	172:18		80:21	114:6	126:19	34:21 70:17 88:4 90:2	86:14 105:22	kiwis [3]	191:16
inter-agency [3	5:22		173:8	151:21			110:11 113:25		191:16 191:18	171.10
11:1 51:20	52:21	irrigation [3] 35:15 96:7	2:16	items [7	1 5:10	4:11 5:13	123:23 133:2	137:2	knew [3]	171:11
interest [17]	9:1	i	21:13	10:2	15:16	207:15	138:16 138:18 152:22 171:11		196:18 204:3	
24:20 76:1	87:4	33:21 33:22	~1.13	iterativ		145:13	203:24	111.43	knowing [2]	70:10
108:3 127:23 128:7 129:3	128:1 129:11	l	22:24	itself [5	30:10	32:23	keeping [3]	9:20	188:15 <b>knowledge</b> [3]	6.6
128:7 129:3	149:11	30:11		33:19	169:3	209:24	131:7 131:8		171:9 171:14	0.0
190:4 190:5	199:20		30:22	IZMIR			keeps [2]	41:23	known [2]	34:11
202:7			15:15	33:6 156:12	155:17	126:8	115:10	46.00	67:2	· <del></del>
interested [6] 70:14 131:9	70:10		45:7 53:24	Jack [6]	2:9	60:10	KELLEY [1] kept [3] 134:11	46:20	knows [2]	71:4
179:5 203:13	177:5		59:14		216:21	216:22	194:10	136:21	117:6	
interesting [2]	182:9	59:19 61:6	67:10	216:24			Kern [3] 3:15	111:12	Kohler [1]	133:21
202:22		74:10 75:25 147:3 147:10	96:10 178:18	jacket [	2]	171:23	181:21		<b>labor</b> [4] 128:6 189:1 194:12	129:12
interests [13]	75:22	178:21	1/0.10	172:3		170:10	key [14] 19:13	33:16	laboring [1]	10:24
107:23 108:7	109:12	1.	11:10	James [		172:13	46:23 50:15	71:6	lack [4] 79:15	10.24
127:22 128:4 141:16 149:20	130:24 152:5	16:12 18:3	18:19	Jeff [4] 121:16		118:3	71:11 93:19 124:24 126:20	112:18 129:17	100:22 118:11	.00.22
164:19 164:21	188:21		26:20 44:6	Jerry [1]			141:11 150:22	216:16	laid [3] 12:11	12:20
Interior [2]	11:5		44:0 52:23	Jim [2]		131:17	kidded [1]	133:23	71:19	
71:6		53:9 55:20	57:15	Joaqui		30:20	kind [108]	5:17	Lake [3] 173:14	173:18
internally [1]	48:15	57:19 58:16	60:11	31:17	31:20	31:21	7:25 8:2	8:13	173:18	
		OLATEG DED					•		Τ 1	D 12

BDAC	MEET	ΓING			Co	ndens	eIt <sup>™</sup>			lan	ıd - N	/ladigan
land [65]	19:10	30:19	laying [1]	72:7	levees	8]	14:16	literature [1]	53:2	72:2 7	4:16	88:24
35:5	35:8	35:9	lead [4] 15:20	68:18	27:8	29:4	29:5	live [1] 172:6			04:23	110:18
36:3	36:5	36:7	91:3 203:4	00.10	31:4	32:4	149:8	lived [1] 114:25		111:24 1	30:7	141:23
36:8	48:13	48:17	leader [1]	135:5	169:6				•••		46:8	155:3
48:21	48:24	56:8	,		level [56	51	12:14	lively [1]	208:8	169:4 1	88:14	
56:11	57:4	76:23	leaders [1]	213:19	12:17	12:18	13:7	living [2]	94:13	looks [6]		12:16
76:23	80:6	83:12	leadership [1]	104:3	13:24	14:4	14:24	192:12			2:10	99:21
84:8	90:5	90:20	League [1]	3:2	24:16	34:20	35:16	load [1] 78:9		100:21 2	03:5	
91:1	91:8	91:9	learn [2] 63:24	204:1	37:24	38:14	38:19	loans [1]	213:1	looming	<b>[11</b>	128:10
91:12	91:13	92:15	learning [1]	81:25	39:2	39:9	40:6	lobbying [2]	130:17	loop [1] 2		
92:20 94:5	93:5 94:5	93:19 100:16	least [20]	6:6	40:13	41:14	42:23	202:14	150.17	Los [3] 1		177.14
105:6	113:17		18:7 18:8	18:13	59:5	59:8	59:9	local [17]	34:24	193:17	74:10	1//:14
	123:3	125:11	48:1 64:17	65:12	60:1	73:11	74:23	34:24 35:16	35:23		00.15	
	125:13		100:20 120:21		76:14	79:9	83:13	35:24 38:9	38:20	lose [1] 1		
	142:21	142:24	157:16 160:14	161:5	84:5	84:7 104:25	84:18 105:1	62:23 93:11	93:21	losing [3]		74:16
143:4	143:4	143:8	177:13 182:4	183:22	104:23		103:1	112:3 188:24		169:17 1	92:8	
	143:12		198:2 198:23		103.14	103.17	118:16	212:4 214:21	215:1	loss [2] 3	3:18	55:1
	143:23	143:23	215:12		137:6	137:8	150:10	215:3		losses [1]		64:8
144:3	144:6	144:6	leave [7] 64:21	94:12	159:2	167:19	171:6	locally [1]	212:19	lost [2] 5	3.17	105:9
144:9	144:9	155:24	101:10 120:13	168:10	171:7	178:3	186:18	location [4]	18:2	1.	9:8	130:5
156:7	191:9	210:15	193:12 216:22		194:6	196:10	196:11	24:4 55:14	55:16	188:12		130,3
lands [5		27:17	leaving [1]	170:23	206:21	208:13	208:20	locational		1		
172:18		192:7	led [2] 15:3	98:6	212:21				92:9	love[1] 1		
192:24	=				levels	12]	13:21	locations [4]	6:5		4:2	24:21
landsca	iping 11	1213:9	leery [2] 99:17	100:18	15:1	15:15	19:18	22:3 34:3	188:12	1	5:4	129:17
languag	_	9:6	left [3] 148:21	157:20	19:22	24:16	29:5	locked [2]	68:10	lower [8]		22:19
43:11	103:2	105:2	171:20		37:8	37:18	143:17	106:25			7:17	59:1
157:1	207:25		legal [3] 67:1	132:10	149:3	161:12		logging [1]	190:22	59:5 5	9:8	60:3
large [21	13	29:25	200:1		leverag	ing [1]	195:3	logic [1] 124:18				
31:25	32:13	32:19	legally [1]	200:19	life [6]	55:23	83:22	logical [1]	60:24	luck[1] 1	30:22	
33:3	34:1	45:19	legislative [1]	131:5	114:15		119:15	long-term [10]	8:12	lucky [1]		129:25
52:14	52:15	53:17	legislator[1]	128:25	191:1			37:17 78:7	149:13	Luis [6] 1	17:13	172:5
54:21	63:20	82:15	legislature [2]	128:25	light [2]	98:7	136:24	150:3 163:8	166:15		73:11	173:13
90:20	93:8	142:24	179:19	120.25	likely [		51:1	175:24 176:3	179:22	173:17		
	148:23	150:12	legitimate [2]	137:22	198:17	-1		longer [6]	163:12	lunch [8]		4:18
195:14			160:4	137.22	likes [1]	14.2		164:7 175:10	180:5		23:22	
largely		15:10	legitimately [1	100.0	limit [5]		88:15	192:18 192:22			26:10	141:8
46:5	50:12	77:9				178:18	178:18	look [67] 7:16	14:23	141:12		
larger [		23:18	lemons [1]	191:20	limited			20:13 21:25	22:17	1	15:25	
49:2	53:10	160:14	lend [1] 133:9				176:11	26:14 35:11	35:15	Maddock	K [13]	2:12
l_	194:22	206:2	length [1]	5:9	limits [		137:14	36:8 53:3	58:18	Į.	2:25	88:12
largest		29:17	less [17] 34:3	35:18	147:7	159:23	198:5	59:3 59:21	60:2	134:17 1		139:10
29:21	181:23		36:5 40:16	40:17	line [7]	42:15	44:2	60:11 60:14	80:2			153:17
larvae [		33:10	44:17 59:18	92:11	67:24	157:12	180:6	81:13 89:16	89:20	153:20 1		186:22
33:14	33:17	34:3	103:4 103:5	115:5	1	199:14		91:11 91:12	91:25	Madigan		2:2
last [25]	4:16	8:19	144:7 164:19		lines [3]	67:24	93:13	97:18 99:3	99:5		:16	7:20
13:17	16:7	24:1	184:19 193:8	197:18	98:5			99:6 103:5 103:11 104:1	103:9 104:11		0:12	16:23
34:10	47:17	51:18	lesser [2]	60:21	lingeri		90:23	111:12 112:8	112:24		5:8	25:12
56:9	63:13	64:7	128:6		link [1]	212:22		114:1 114:22			:7:5 :4:9	31:15 37:3
93:6	95:12	97:6	Lester [40]	2:4	linkage	[1]	43:15		137:13		0:18	45:5
98:16	100:20 154:13	122:19	42:6 46:3	46:23	linked		163:20	137:18 142:1	142:15		6:16	46:19
130:21	202:5	187:1 202:12	66:1 68:4	68:18	lion's		131:6	144:10 144:16			6:4	58:7
	202:3	202.12	68:20 71:19	72:14				145:2 145:4	145:5	1	1:1	61:17
lasting		11.10	75:10 79:18 81:1 90:18	79:23 91:7	list [14] 74:13	78:18	57:23 80:21		146:20	62:10 6	3:3	64:11
		11:18	94:7 99:3	104:5	80:22	81:11	81:17	148:10 149:12			6:21	67:17
lastly [3		70:16	106:5 106:7	107:10		140:16		159:14 159:15 167:8 167:22	165:2 175:15		0:25	72:13
120:15				109:25	151:6	189:10	194:13	177:11 184:7	188:22		32:7	82:19
late [2]		47:24	118:22 120:7	122:3	listed		155:11	200:12 208:24	100.22		6:22	87:7
latitude	C [2]	41:2	127:15 131:25	132:9	listen [		9:15	looked [9]	20:3		37:23 90:17	88:11 92:13
42:9			139:25 143:14	156:16	40:19	40:23	9:15 71:8	36:6 101:3	20:3 103:12		6:18	96:21
laughte	<b>F</b> [2]	110:5	160:23 167:25		147:15	.0.23	, 1.0	165:11 165:14			7:23	98:19
169:18			1	201:24	listenii	10 ra	131:8	205:1 214:5	2.0.17		.01:9	101:22
law [4]	77:17	122:3	letter [4] 79:25	87:17		139:20	121:9	looking [33]	4:15		02:6	102:11
122:9	169:21		117:3 182:4				01.17	9:2 15:15	19:4			104:17
laws [3]	151:15	151:20	letting [1]	97:12	listing	[3] 140:15	81:17	19:18 20:8	21:10	105:23 1	06:6	107:18
152:14			levee [8] 14:15	28:12	82:4		05.0	22:1 25:3	25:25	109:16 1		
lawsuit	ts [1]	176:15	28:20 28:21	28:24	litany [		95:9	30:17 33:19	35:9	111:18 1		
lay [1]			29:2 30:11	31:3	literall		63:17	38:1 39:8	51:25			117:25
""					82:24	199:19		53:11 57:4	62:11	120:23 1	21:20	122:11
			<del></del>					·		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		

	BDAC MEE	TING			Co	ndens	eIt™			magnitude -	models
134:23   135:9   136:06   136:10   13	123:14 126:4	126:18	mandated [1]	119:20	146:5	146:5	146:7	154:14 182:14	204:7	3:10 71:1	72:13
1842  1859   1			manner [2]	5:11				meeting [39]	1:3		
1399   1401   1401   1401   1401   1401   1402   1512			31:11								165:13
			Mantell [7]	3:10						E .	
15224   153:5   153:15   153											
1351-01   1351			1								
1946   1941   1942   1942   1942   1942   1944   1944   1944   1945   1944	153:19 153:21	154:2									1
				<b>[1]</b>						1	
16424   1665   16625   1625   1734   1711   1714						. (1122)	1-1				110:23
16812   179.5   179.8   279.1   179.				20:13	McPEA	K [14]	2:5				
170-25   171-4   171-17   171-18   17					40:19	41:9	42:2				
174.3   175.2   186.5   181.17   181.5   181.17   181.5   181.27   127.7   127.18   44.10   181.27   127.7   127.18   185.22   186.6   186.21   187.8   187.18   187.18   187.18   187.18   193.20   193.2   194.2   194.2			1 -								
1815   1816   1816   1816   1817   1817   1818   1817   1818				42:10					217.17		
Marine			1 -			188:11	195:20	I .	16:8	105:8 105:9	107:24
1887   1898   1892   market [14]   43:19   43:21   43:19   43:21   43:19   43:21   43:22   44:10   44:11   43:22   202:17   202:20   207:5   43:24   44:10   44:11   44:11   24:22   205:17   202:20   207:5   45:33   96:64   19:23   19:23   19:24   19:23   19:23   202:17   202:20   207:5   45:33   96:64   19:23   19:					1	malda r				118:9 139:13	177:2
1932.1   194.2   194.20   24.2   34					205.12	205:16	3] 205:18		187:14		
19325   194-20   194-20   193-20   193-20   194-20   193-20   194-20   193-20   194-20   193-20   194-20   19					1						
197:21   199:16   201:23   202:33   202:5   207:10   210:60   214:11   214:10   216:22   216:16   216:23   217:3   2								melded [1]	55:9		
2002-17   2012-00   207-5   207-15   207-10   2016-0   214-11   145-11									181:21		_00.25
14-16   215-22   216-16   216-23   217-3   marketable [1]   191:18   marketable [1]   191:18   markets [1]   markets [1]   191:17   191:21   191:23   191:17   191:23   191:13   191:23   191:23   191:33   193:23   193:33   193:33   193:33   193:33   193:33   193:33   193:					51:14	56:7	56:14	1 .			32:6
magnitude   19   19   19   19   18   19   19   18   18				<del></del>	1						
magnitude [3]   94:19   168:9   205:2   191:17   191:17   191:21   191:13			marketable [1]	191:18						7:8 57:13	
168-9   205-2   205-			1							75:6 75:7	87:5
mailing		ノゴ・エブ	191:17 191:21								109:23
markets [1]		122-19									1
30:23   33:19   marshes[ti]   148:18   marshes[ti]   148:18   143:23   136:218   163:66   207:22   210:22   210:22   210:22   210:22   210:22   210:22   210:23   21:18   173:18   17				83:11							i i
33:120   32:11   32:11   maintained [n]   75:23   maintaining [n]   75:13   maintaining [n]   75:13   maintaining [n]   75:13   37:3   39:8   64:11   198:10   198:10   198:10   198:10   198:12   198:12   198:12   198:12   198:12   198:12   198:12   198:12   198:12   198:12   198:12   198:12   198:12   198:12   198:13   198:12   198:13   198:14   198:15   198:			marshes [1]	148:18							173:14
Mary   13   13   13   13   13   13   13   1	31:20 32:1	32:11	marshland [1]	76:25					210:25		
maintainding [1] 75:23 maintainding [1] 76:1 maintenance [5]         Mary [13]         3:4         198:3 199:6 199:7 200:5         75:15         75:15         mind [9] 5:18 8:20         82:0 2:19 209:7 209:3 299:5 209:5 209:5         3:6:21 101:22 102:17 207:10 2109:9 21:24 4 207:7 207:10 2109:9 21:24 4 207:7 207:10 2109:9 21:24 4 207:7 207:10 2109:9 21:24 4 207:7 207:10 2109:9 21:24 4 207:24 21:3 21:18 46:13 72:19 21:18 46:13 72:19 21:18 46:13 72:19 21:18 46:13 72:19 21:18 46:13 72:19 21:19 21:10 21:10 21:19 21:10 21:10 21:19 21:10 21:10 21:19 21:19 21:10 21:19 21			marvelous [1]	131:7				1	71.20		60:17
maintening [1] 76:1   maintenance [5]   29:2   29:3   29:5   66:21   101:22   102:17   20:9   20:15:24   20:15   20:17   20:9   20:5:24   20:18   20:17   20:9   20:19   20:			Mary [13]	3:4					/1.20		0.20
maintenance								1	95-1		
207:10   210:9   215:24								116:14 122:21	123:5		
Mary   13:7   13:20   16:2   21:13   21:18   46:13   72:1   mass   11   128:10   match   (2)   14:1   12:14   13:2   13:2   13:2   13:2   13:2   13:2   13:2   13:3   13:2   13:2   13:3   13:2   13:3   13:2   13:3   13:2   13:3   13:2   13:3   13:2   13:3   13:3   13:2   13:3   13:2   13:3   13:2   13:3   13		29:5			1					170:21	Į.
13:20			l .		meanin	gful [1]				mine [2] 27:22	195:18
13.20   10.2   21.18   46:13   72:1   match   22   14:13   72:3   72:9   75:25   86:14   96:9   98:12   17:16   17:1				37.1				_		mineral [1]	150:14
This				14.1							27:23
86:14   96:19   98:12   129:6   133:8   176:2   208:4   208:25   134:25   202:25   134:25				14;1							36:10
129:6   133:8   176:2   208:4   208:25   182:24   182:24   182:24   182:24   182:24   182:24   182:24   182:24   182:24   182:24   182:24   182:24   182:24   182:24   182:24   182:24   182:24   183:12   176:25   176:25   176:24   182:24   183:12   176:25   176:24   182:24   183:12   176:25   176:25   176:24   182:24   183:12   176:25   176:24   183:19   176:25   176:25   176:24   176:25   176:24   176:25   176:24   176:25   176:24   176:25   176:25   176:24   176:25   176:25   176:24   176:25   176:25   176:25   176:24   176:25   176:25   176:24   176:25   176:25   176:25   176:25   176:25   176:24   176:25   176:2	86:14 96:9		ł	52.12	E						
Table   Tabl	128:1 129:6						7.10				
makes [2]   182:24     183:12     material [6]   4:14   4:16   16:14   17:12   17:32     man [1]   117:6     man made [1]   17:32     materials [1]   166:7     130:2   130:6   132:11     132:15     133:19   163:22     mert [1]   163:22     mert [1]   163:12     materials [1]   53:17     mere [1]   163:22   merely [1]   168:19   merely [1]   132:16	1 -				1		118-11			191:22 192:3	
Man [i]   117:6   man made [i]   173:2   materials [i]   166:7   matrix [i]   53:17   mater [ii]   54:22   129:24   materials [ii]   168:3   128:11   132:4   14:18   27:21   27:25   28:3   28:5   34:12   42:23   51:3   51:9   51:14   62:16   62:24   63:22   64:9   83:6   83:7   83:9   84:9   87:8   103:23   105:3   105:5   112:16   144:1   145:5   151:10   152:19   155:18   156:1   156:9   159:20   160:11   166:19   177:7   171:12   185:14   37:8   38:9   39:10   166:19   175:17   171:12   185:14   48:24   59:24   68:6   48:28   59:24   68:6   68:23   87:6   90:18   128:11   129:12   129:12   129:24   130:2   130:6   132:11   130:2   130:6   132:14   130:2   130:6   132:14   130:2   130:6   132:14   130:2   130:6   132:14   130:2   130:6   132:14   130:2   130:6   132:14   130:2   130:6   132:14   130:2   130:6   132:14   130:2   130:6   132:14   130:2   130:6   132:14   130:2   130:6   132:14   130:2   130:6   132:14   130:2   130:6   132:14   130:2   13		182:24			1			131:13 131:19	186:22		51:22
Man-made [1]   17/8   man-made [1]   17/8   man-made [1]   17/8   materials [1]   166:7   matrix [1]   53:17   materials [1]   54:22   62:2   103:8   108:3   17/8:23   162:7   213:24   13:19   materials [1]   54:22   62:2   103:8   108:3   17/8:25   17/8:25   17/8:25   17/8:25   17/8:25   17/8:25   17/8:25   17/8:25   17/8:26   17/8	1				1			mentioning [1]	104:5		90:18
manage [5]   27:20		172.5			129:14	129:21	129:24	Merced [1]	31:21		
matrix [1]   53:17     142:25     139:17   142:25     143:12   157:14   158:2     158:23   162:7   213:24     139:19     168:19     merely [1]   168:19   merely [1]   10:22     matrix [1]   54:22   103:8   108:3   173:24   175:12   175:20   175:25   176:13   176:25   179:6   179:6   179:6   179:6   132:24   139:17   142:25     143:12   157:14   158:2     158:23   162:7   213:24     merely [1]   10:22     merely [1]   10:22     merely [1]   10:22   merely [1]   10:23   merely [1]   10:23   merely [1]   10:22   merely [1]   10:23   merely [1]   10:2	1		materials [1]	166:7				mere [1] 163:22			
Matter   M	manage [5]			53:17				merely [1]	168:19		1
management [43]         62:2 103:8 108:3 175:20 175:20 175:22 175:20 175:25 176:13 176:25 176:13 176:25 176:13 176:25 179:6         management [43]         Merrill [1] 132:16 Merril		144:10									124:11
14:18   27:21   27:25   173:24   175:12   175:20   20:24   29:1   37:6   39:22   42:14   96:13   125:7   125:16   132:21   132:4   133:12   163:4   198:12   136:14   136:14   136:14   136:14   136:14   136:14   136:14   136:14   136:14   136:14   136:15   151:10   152:19   155:18   156:1   156:4   156:9   159:20   160:11   160:19   171:7   171:12   1	l .	./21	62:2 103:8	108:3	1						
28:3 28:5 34:12					1			1			90.14
42:23   51:3   51:9   51:14   62:16   62:24   63:22   64:9   83:6   83:7   83:9   84:9   136:14   13				170:25	39:22	42:14	96:13	87:24 90:3			82:14
63:22 64:9 83:6 83:7 83:9 84:9 87:8 103:23 105:3 105:5 112:16 144:1 145:5 151:10 152:19 155:18 156:1 156:4 156:9 159:20 160:11 160:19 171:7 171:12 185:14 208:15 208:19 185:12 109:8 124:15 167:16 198:12 109:8 124:15 167:16 179:8 124:15 167:16 179:8 124:15 167:16 179:8 124:15 167:16 198:12 109:8 124:15 167:16 179:2 199:4 202:4 179:2 199:4 202:4				122.4							02.7
83:7 83:9 84:9 87:8 103:23 105:3 105:5 112:16 144:1 145:5 151:10 152:19 155:18 156:1 156:4 156:9 159:20 160:11 160:19 171:7 171:12 185:14 208:15 208:						163:4	198:12				
87:8 103:23 105:3 105:3 105:5 112:16 144:1 145:5 151:10 152:19 155:18 156:1 156:4 156:9 159:20 160:11 160:19 171:7 171:12 185:14 208:15				ſī]	l .	ina	140.0				
105:5   112:16   144:1   145:5   151:10   152:19   155:18   156:1   156:4   156:9   159:20   160:11   160:19   171:7   171:12   171:12   185:14   208:15   208:19   208:15   208:19   208:19   208:15   208:19   208:10   208:15   208:19   208:15				50.24		111g [2]	140:8	1/9:2 199:4			
145:5 151:10 152:19 155:18 156:1 156:4 156:9 159:20 160:11 160:19 171:7 171:12 185:14 208:15 208:19  148:18 33:12 33:21 37:8 38:9 39:10 45:21 47:13 48:18  mechanisms [1] 48:14 48:25 125:11 194:18  mechanisms [1] 48:25 125:11 194:18	105:5 112:16	144:1		JJ.47	18	4.12					
156:9 159:20 160:11   37:8 38:9 39:10   167:11 196:1 196:1   214:21   methods [4] 48:14   48:25 125:11 194:18   171:12   48:25 125:11 194:18   171:12   48:25 125:11 194:18   171:12	145:5 151:10			33:21			02-11				
160:19 171:7 171:12   45:21 47:13 48:18   mechanisms [1]   48:24 59:24 68:6   166:21   48:25 125:11 194:18   methods [4] 48:25 125:11 194:18   mechanisms [7]   171:12   171:1											
185:14 208:15 208:19   48:24 59:24 68:6   166:21   48:25 125:11 194:18   37.7			45:21 47:13	48:18					48:14		90:20
					166:21	ا) فستمت	٠,			model [1]	97:7
209:3 209:18 210:20   70:7 /0:12 /0:3   media [2]   107:11   metrics [1]   113:12   modeling [2]   74:22	209:3 209:18					21	107:11	metrics [1]	113:12		
211:24   82:20 88:8 93:17   129:21   129:8   Metropolitan [1]   100:11   129:14   12	211:24								[1]		/7.22
managing [4] 27:16   140:23 141:1 143:3   meet [8] 22:2 35:21   2:9   models [2] 80:10					1	22:2	35:21	2:9	-	1	80:10
28:6 84:10 152:3   144:2 145:11 145:13   48:22 121:10 124:16   Michael [11] 2:2   81:19	28:6 84:10	152:3						Michael [11]	2:2		33.20
DODTALE & ACCOCIATES DEPOSITION DEPODTEDS								<u></u>		<u> </u>	

\_\_\_\_

BDAC MEET	TING			Condens	eIt™			NRDC - pa	rticular
205:4 208:6	209:23	officials [1]	188:25	54:12 61:9	61:13	orienting [1]	87:22	p.m [2] 126:15	217:14
210:18 216:22		offstream[1]	177:9	81:14 103:20		origin [3]	50:25	<b>p.m.</b> [1] 126:16	
NRDC [3] 152:2 152:15	151:21	often [3] 8:7	161:9	operation [3] 59:15 190:13	53:8	179:13 179:23		pace [1] 138:19	
	9:2	172:20		operational [3]	60.0	original [2]	104:20	pack [1] 193:8	
nuances [1] number [37]	9:2 4:21	old [2] 14:25	47:16	76:2 169:4	00:8	otherwise [5]	83:18	package [8]	50:23
24:22 29:21	34:2	oldie [1] 9:25		operations [1]	113:2	90:10 95:1	184:19	53:16 128:2 151:17 164:5	131:22 179:19
46:25 47:22	56:8	on-site [1]	27:23	opinion [4]	73:25	199:6	201125	199:12	179:19
56:15 58:19	59:10	once [7] 73:19 131:1 134:8	128:10 163:13	80:9 97:25	117:3	Ottowaller [3]	123:21	packages [1]	164:4
63:6 68:14 89:10 95:5	70:7 118:21	204:20 214:16	103.13	opinions [2]	209:9	123:24 144:11		packaging [1]	18:16
124:3 126:8	130:3	one [133] 9:14	10:15	210:3		ought [11]	7:13	packet [13]	13:16
132:23 134:20	137:3	12:9 13:17	14:2	opportunities		68:1 69:4 90:25 108:25	88:18 147:25	17:20 37:5	46:22
	156:8	14:12 16:2	17:22	23:19 31:4 38:11 39:15	33:20 44:15	168:7 168:10	199:13	47:4 47:7	47:19
158:13 159:10 181:25 188:16	176:11 194:8	17:22 19:1 19:24 19:25	19:1 21:17	44:18 45:9	45:22	215:8		56:12 56:24 75:10 115:14	56:25 125:5
194:15 194:22	196:20	22:23 24:9	30:25	46:12 46:14	49:20	ourselves [3]	68:1	page [7] 37:7	39:8
205:8 205:23	212:6	31:19 31:24	34:15	144:20 149:15		68:7 166:4		39:14 40:12	42:25
numbers [4]	113:12	35:4 36:14	37:14	opportunity [1		Outcomes [1]	46:23	43:8 180:20	
114:2 125:18	205:5	37:18 37:22 43:9 44:25	41:16 45:6	5:2 14:14 43:1 45:12	39:12 45:14	outdoor[1]	96:7	paid[1] 71:14	
nutshell [1]	28:10	49:23 51:10	52:23	46:2 53:20	99:13	outflow [2]	26:21	painful [1]	13:1
o'clock [2]	214:10	54:20 54:21	55:24	101:6 107:6	107:10	160:5	160.10	paired [1]	19:11
217:14	25.5	57:25 57:25	58:2	161:19		outline [3] 169:10 207:17	168:19	paper [4]	125:23
object [2] 162:4	35:5	58:11 59:7 60:12 64:14	60:3 66:5	oppose [1]	180:10	outlining [1]	81:7	125:24 126:1	203:8
objection [2]	154:4	66:12 66:22	69:9	opposed [4]	99:7	outreach [6]	131:24	papers [1]	132:22
154:7	154.4	72:17 75:20	80:16	110:3 175:17	196:5	186:19 187:6	188:19	paradigm [1]	103:20
objections [1]	154:3	84:3 88:20	90:1	opposing [1]	180:9	193:4 194:18		paragraph [1]	130:1
objective [4]	124:9	90:19 91:6 92:21 98:4	92:17 99:19	opposition [2] 129:18	129:14	outreached [2]	74:1	parallel [8]	16:13
124:13 124:15	124:16	101:17 102:21		optimism [1]	8:3	190:4		85:6 85:7 99:25 187:3	99:24 199:21
objectives [25]		110:8 110:11		optimize [3]	19:12	outset [1]	188:4	200:17	177.21
35:23 48:22 119:6 119:20	118:12	111:14 111:22	112:1	19:15 76:10	17.12	outside [2] 55:19	32:1	paralleled [1]	67:5
	120:1 145:22	112:11 116:16 116:17 117:9	116:17 118:22	option [1]	21:21	over-reliance		paralysis [1]	171:15
145:23 156:20		119:19 120:8	120:8	options [10]	12:5	142:23	[1]	paranoia [1]	124:6
157:19 158:8	158:10	123:11 124:8	126:2	12:5 20:9	34:17	overall[11]	41:19	parcels[1]	177:16
	158:17	127:19 133:4	134:21	35:11 45:8 76:6 145:5	68:11	48:18 56:1	75:2	parentheticall	<b>y</b> [2]
158:23 159:9 159:13 167:20	159:9 207:21	135:10 135:15 140:9 142:1	139:10 142:7		203:9	136:21 157:10	185:18	106:14 106:23	•
obligation [1]	142:8	144:22 145:4	145:16	oranges [1] order [13]	191:20	204:5 204:22 216:8	207:25	parity [1]	185:5
observations [		147:13 149:18	150:7	78:11 92:11	11:18 94:15		176:13	part [54] 32:21	32:22
127:11	-,	153:11 157:7 158:6 159:5	157:17 162:5	104:9 104:25	105:15	overestimates		34:15 36:13 42:18 44:8	40:20 47:17
observed [1]	192:20	162:12 164:13		126:19 128:1	191:17	146:16	ſīĵ	50:5 50:18	50:18
observing [1]	216:20	170:17 170:19	170:19	200:12 212:13		overheads [3]	10:1	50:21 50:24	59:2
obvious [3]	35:9	170:20 170:23		orders [4] 191:21 191:23	191:14	69:1 205:11		62:21 64:18	67:15
66:24 67:2		177:14 178:17 181:3 182:3	179:6 183:15	ordinance [1]	160:20	overlap [1]	31:8	69:13 71:10 87:20 93:11	81:23 93:15
obviously [5]	71:15	186:10 186:13		ordinances [2]		overlay [1]	168:11		119:17
89:15 144:13 166:7	155:5	196:15 196:16	197:15	96:9	70.7	overlooked [3]	76:20	124:2 134:2	142:8
occur[1]	111:5	197:15 197:24		ordinary [1]	188:14	140:22 140:24		143:10 143:15	
occurred [1]	31:24	199:23 200:11 203:14 208:12		organic [5]	80:8	overly [1]	49:12	144:3 146:13 153:8 155:2	152:16 155:21
occurring [3]	47:24	213:10 214:2	200.17	190:9 191:11		overlying [2]	176:12	163:10 163:18	163:21
212:23 213:2	, , , <u>au</u> F	ones [5] 14:16	54:7	192:14	100 4 5		169:13	165:1 165:8	165:17
occurs [1]	70:9	121:7 137:23	-	organisms [2] 192:13	192:12	overriding [1]	169:13	166:4 166:9 167:12 179:19	167:12 186:23
ocean [3]	26:3	ongoing [4]	50:9	organization	-41	1	169:9	190:14 195:21	
26:10 176:5		67:14 165:3	195:7		89:20	oversees [1] oversight [3]	165:3	204:24	
off [19] 16:15	17:11	oOo [2] 3:16	217:15	197:2	J	166:3 167:15	103:3	participants [4	
22:20 41:20 63:17 64:3	45:10 81:6	<b>open</b> [9] 11:24 68:10 149:14	43:19 150:8	organization'	<b>S</b> [1]	overview [3]	7:20	48:6 48:17	209:25
	113:10	151:19 189:3	196:11	159:21		7:25 198:25	· · · · <del>·</del>	participate [1]	
113:11 129:2	141:12	196:13		organizations		own [6] 71:15	83:22	participated [1	
143:8 147:14	158:9	opening [1]	130:1	70:1 98:11 165:22 189:1	106:3	83:22 107:5	159:21	participating	
167:17 172:10	<b></b>	operate [2]	15:7	organized [2]	129:14	197:1	100		179:10
Off-the-record	d [3] 170:3	176:18		129:18	147,14	owners [2] 177:16	177:13	particular [23] 29:16 47:1	7:14 49:24
official [4]	3:6	operated [2]	61:14	orientation [1]	98:18	ownership [1]	177:12	58:11 60:1	64:1
3:10 13:13	31:11	113:7	10.16	oriented [2]	29:23	oxygen [1]	192:15	98:23 99:4	109:10
	*= *	operating [7]	19:16	115:25		Or A Bon [1]	172.13	110:19 114:6	131:13
L		CIATES DE				<u>l</u>		Index	

BDAC MEET	ring			Co	ndens	eIt™				particularly -	precise
133:2 137:17	145:10	112:4 115:15	116:1	193:6	193:7	193:16	36:4	38:20	39:3	78:23 79:8	103:9
147:22 148:12	155:1	116:15 116:25	126:12	194:1			44:4	44:11	44:19	138:14 138:16	
160:12 168:1	171:19		133:19	phase [7	72]	6:19	51:1	75:3	83:10	138:22 185:20	197:24
209:17		134:9 139:11		7:5	9:24	10:20	95:24	113:7	128:12	political [2]	59:10
particularly [12		167:5 168:22		11:6	12:11	12:12	156:6	165:5	165:23	108:19	
18:4 30:8	47:19		178:13	12:14	12:17	12:18	204:7	204:21	211:18	polling [1]	129:15
87:10 92:24	128:13	180:7 182:17 187:7 187:20	188:15	12:23	12:24	15:19	214:8	214:21		pollsters [1]	129:22
146:22 148:6	162:17		191:25	15:19	16:12	16:19	places	_	68:6	pollution [2]	27:24
173:2 187:1	201:3	194:16 197:13	206:14	19:14 48:2	47:3 48:2	47:6 50:21	plan [18]		40:10	77:13	<i>41.</i> 4⊤
parties [7]	4:1	209:24 213:15	213:17	52:19	52:24	66:24	41:11	41:12	48:3	pool [9] 61:5	61:12
120:9 126:20 163:22 204:5	131:9 204:6	215:20 217:6		74:3	74:6	74:14	61:9 78:3	61:13 93:12	61:15 95:15	75:24 172:8	172:10
1		per [6] 24:11	54:21	74:22	80:5	80:9	119:17		196:23	172:17 173:3	173:6
partner[1]	212:12	65:2 65:16	78:4	80:19	80:23	81:2	197:6	205:24	206:22	182:11	
partnership [1]		176:14		81:3	81:8	87:13	207:21			poor[1] 32:21	
partridge [1]	58:11	perceived [1]	108:6	90:9	90:11	90:14	plane [1	1	134:8	population [4]	78:5
parts [7] 19:19	35:1	percent [9]	159:5	90:23	102:23	106:16	planne	_	86:3	78:6 81:20	174:23
37:21 110:6	111:10	171:10 171:10	177:15	107:2	107:4 110:12	107:13	plannin		35:25	populations [1]	183-20
149:14 172:25		178:1 205:6	205:7	135:20	137:11		38:21	39:21	33:23 48:1	PORTALE [5]	
party [7] 35:10	97:5	205:19 205:19		139:3		140:17	62:25	78:6	83:8	1:23 218:3	218:22
97:9 97:15	99:1	percentages [1]	205:21	140:18		142:2	112:14		186:12	218:24	
111:2 216:22		perceptions [1]		145:6	150:3	154:20	plans [3		28:3	portion [4]	59:20
pass [5] 102:3	127:16	perfectly [1]	153:2	155:8	158:24	188:6		62:24	20.5	61:8 182:1	208:4
130:22 160:17	160:22	perform [1]	110:13	189:21		198:19	plants		52:16	portions [2]	75:15
passage [3]	8:14	performance [4		199:22	200:17	201:22	53:5	53:14	124:21	150:16	13.13
128:11 129:19		13:5 121:6	121:10	206:24			172:20		121.21	position [3]	147:14
passed [3]	127:6	158:23	121.10	phased		84:12	play [1]	213.8		149:17 159:22	177.17
128:16 130:17		performed [1]	13:14	155:3	167:19		played		190:14	positions [1]	147:14
passes [1]	132:11			phases	[2]	111:23					
passing [1]	151:9	performing [1]		158:6			plays [1	_	45:2	positive [2]	175:21
passion [1]	122:24	performs [1]	152:6	phasing		47:23	pleased		31:12		
past[11] 11:12	42:9	perhaps [27]	11:13	48:3	51:7		pleasur		136:17	possibilities [1	ij
	161:6	35:15 38:1	40:20	phenon	nenal [1	183:17	plenty	1]	91:24	150:8	27.0
161:15 161:18	161:21	42:6 43:11 59:19 60:14	50:19 89:5	philoso		[5]	plug [1]	132:5		possibility [1]	
172:19 173:21	198:10	92:10 121:9	127:2	25:25	39:13	39:18	plumbi		108:18	possible [14]	5:8
path [4] 86:6	86:11	131:25 141:20	144:7	40:11	42:22		pockets		20:16	6:7 7:3	34:16
86:13 156:25		144:21 147:17	150:2	philoso	phy [4]	26:13	point [6		8:1	34:17 36:20 55:13 70:4	45:18 70:8
paths [2]	85:6	159:12 183:12	184:19	42:4	103:9	151:24	8:10	10:20	29:15	75:18 158:18	
199:21		186:24 187:5	187:17	Phipps	[6]	118:2	36:7	36:22	39:18	214:4	211.3
patterns [3]	15:11	189:1 204:1		118:3	120:25	121:16	40:4	41:24	42:9	possibly [2]	101:2
20:1 35:17		period [8]	5:15		156:19		42:14	48:16	49:11	111:12	101.2
Patterson [4]	3:6	6:1 56:19	102:7	phonet	iC [2]	131:16	50:20	52:7	62:14	poster[1]	115:3
7:4 68:22	69:17	129:4 150:8	164:7	132:16			62:18	62:21	65:9	posture [1]	189:7
Patterson's [1]	116:17	208:21		phrase	[2]	46:11	66:5	67:20	68:19	_ · ·	107.7
pause [1]	16:21	periods [4]	30:15	125:5	_		70:21 84:14	70:24 85:15	72:1 88:24	pot [1] 141:23	=====
pay [7] 9:4	41:25	33:17 63:14	176:3	physica		54:20	95:4	99:2	104:5	potable [2]	78:13
111:15 157:25		Peripheral [2]	62:2	55:16	59:24	75:22		118:10		78:14	
196:3 206:14	<b></b>	106:19		168:19				124:23		potential [11]	49:3
paying [3]	23:7	permanent [13]		piano [2	2]	17:3	131:23	133:25	136:3	49:13 50:2 69:22 77:7	51:10 110:15
95:13 206:9		48:24 93:8	93:10	17:4			136:3	139:10		146:19 146:23	
payments [3]	178:3	93:19 93:22 125:11 143:10	94:5 143:12	pick [3]	59:9	118:24		146:25		197:15	110.2
206:11 206:11		143:20 144:2	156:6	151:13			149:5	159:1	159:6	pounds [1]	172:23
pays [2] 120:20	195:23	person [4]	65:24	picked		17:16		167:22 171:15	167:25 189:16	poured[1]	117:1
PCL [1] 132:16	~,	108:24 177:2	205:20	24:24	58:19	114:20	196:4	198:11	203:3		
peak [1] 60:15		personal [2]	130:15	115:3		<b>71.</b> 22	208:6	209:7	203.3	pouring [1]	81:20
		197:1	150.13	picking	-	71:22	pointed		36:21	power [6]	3:12
pears [1] 191:20		perspective [7]	72.22	picture	[2]	34:18	48:17	52:11	138:13	8:14 118:4 121:5 166:10	120:11
peat [1] 150:1		127:2 132:12		89:21			167:7	211:8	213:16		170.10
people [66]	8:4	164:23 198:1	198:22	piece [1			pointin		104:24	practical [4] 171:13 184:14	170:19 186:8
8:6 8:8	8:16	perspectives [		Pine [3]	45:16	45:17	points		13:2		
8:22 9:4 9:16 11:25	9:9 13:23	209:9 210:3	-1	45:18			33:22		121:22	practically [1]	
36:21 44:11	47:2	pertinent [1]	191:21	Pinoch		172:25	policie		79:11	practices [7]	103:24
49:10 50:16	51:24	pesticides [1]	28:4	1	173:10		93:17	~ [~]	17.11	104:4 104:6 192:22 210:20	160:6 211:24
61:19 69:8	74:16			pits [2]		32:4	policy	191	9:2	1	
75:5 90:16	91:12	Petry [14] 116:14 116:14	116:13	pivotal	[2]	99:15	9:5	9:6	9:8	praising [1]	98:9
92:18 94:16	95:1	122:24 171:22		101:7			9:20	43:12	55:3	pre-disturban	ce [1]
101:1 101:2	106:18	172:2 174:5	175:2	place [2	21]	26:17	55:10	77:19	78:16	208:14	205.0
109:10 109:12	110:7	<u></u>		<u></u>						precise [1]	205:8
PORTALES	1000	CI A DEC SE	2007							T 1	Page 18

BDAC MEET	ΓING				Co	ndense	eIt™			preclude -	putting
preclude [1]	168:2	prioritio		48:5	produc	<b>t</b> [1]	201:2	162:16 162:16		71:11 75:21	78:8
precludes [1]	160:20		48:10	51:6	produc	tive [1]	91:13		175:20	79:3 104:3	104:10
prefer [2]	57:21		77:17		produc	tivity [2	2]	184:11 184:14 184:20 184:23	184:17 185:4	109:12 110:9 156:24 198:10	118:6 198:25
86:17		<b>Prioriti</b> : 28:23	zation	[1]	32:18	63:13			186:8	200:22 212:4	190.23
preference [2]	195:22	prioriti:	70	119:7	ргодгаг		8:25	202:24 203:1	203:20	provided [1]	168:11
197:2		priority		14:14	9:2 10:16	9:16 11:17	9:19 12:5	211:6 211:19	212:20	provides [2]	72:11
preferred [4]	12:4	52:19	[2]	14;14	12:11	12:14	12:3	213:22		108:19	, 4,111
37:10 200:13		privileg	e m	123:11	12:19	13:24	14:3	progress [4]	7:21	providing [7]	18:9
preliminaries     128:18	[1]	pro-acti		189:17	14:9	14:12	14:15	56:2 75:13	78:16	29:6 30:7	83:8
preliminary [5]	12.22	problen		12:7	14:19	14:25	15:4	progressive [1]		86:11 121:3	146:6
13:4 50:3	204:19		12:21	13:2	18:25 20:12	19:23 20:15	20:11 20:22	prohibited [1]	12:5	public [50]	4:20
210:12		27:15	33:9	34:7	22:3	20:13	23:8	prohibitive [1]		4:23 5:2 5:25 10:25	5:15 13:8
premature [2]	166:23		61:2	77:14	23:23	27:11	27:12	<b>project</b> [11] 64:10 65:19	12:18 65:20	16:8 57:11	67:21
209:13		94:14 143:11	120:14	127:5 180:23	28:10	28:12	29:12	66:18 84:16	84:21	71:9 73:25	79:1
premise [1]	184:22	181:14			29:17 31:2	29:18 31:8	29:23 31:13		187:22	83:21 87:11	102:7
preparation [2]	28:18	problen			33:8	34:16	35:20	188:4		102:15 106:16 107:3 107:7	107:3 111:22
29:4		problen			37:2	37:11	47:24	projected [1]	25:16		130:7
prepared [2]	17:12	36:2		r-1	48:23	49:23	50:1	projections [2]	198:17	130:9 133:11	141:19
48:3	20.2	problen	ns [20]	12:2	50:8	51:3	52:12	199:1		141:22 151:14	186:18
preparing [1]	28:2	31:19	73:1	74:17	56:1 62:22	62:16 63:21	62:19 72:7	projects [9]	28:22	187:22 189:13	193:4
prescribes [1]	122:6	104:15		117:10	73:2	73:7	73:7	28:24 32:2 47:25 50:10	47:24 66:16	194:6 194:13 201:5 201:6	195:14 201:20
prescriptive [1]		117:23	124:8	125:24 158:9	77:11	82:13	82:14	142:13 147:12	00.10	201.3 201.0	213:18
present [4] 55:4 74:13	4:1 87:15	164:12		176:8	82:17	83:2	83:3	prolonged [1]	94:10	213:25 214:1	214:2
presentation [2			176:15		84:12 90:21	84:23 91:17	87:14 92:8	promise [2]	11:24	214:7 214:7	216:20
52:3 210:21	<b>2</b> ]	177:6			90:21	93:9	93:9	154:15		217:3	
presentations	<b>[3]</b>	procedu		81:14	93:15	93:19	93:20	promising [3]	180:22	publics [1]	74:1
138:14 189:10		proceed		73:13	94:1	94:6	96:2	181:8 181:10		published [1]	62:3
presented [7]	54:5		138:15		96:17	97:20	98:5	prompt [1]	4:6	<b>pull</b> [1] 172:16	
54:7 57:10	126:22	proceed			98:14 106:13	100:8 107:7	101:10 107:11	promptly [1]	4:19	pulled [1]	184:13
153:7 203:9	205:5	proceed			107:25	108:6	108:8	proper [5]	74:2	pumped [1]	45:24
presenting [1]	215:21	4:1	_	218:12	109:14	110:9	113:13	84:18 111:2	149:3	pumping [5]	52:16
presently [1]	54:12	proceed		157:3	113:16	119:1	119:3	200:24	101.17	53:4 53:5 179:3	172:19
preserve [2]	31:5	process 7:20	8:1	6:21 8:6	122:4 124:10	122:16 141:20	142:17	properly [2] 101:19	101:17	pumps [4]	20:5
61:16	<b>61.4</b>	9:12	10:1	11:24	142:22	145:21	148:3	proposal [4]	21:19	20:6 64:3	116:2
preserves [1]	61:4		13:10	13:13	148:15	149:1	149:11	133:8 200:21	213:6	purchase [1]	146:15
preserving [3]	75:20	1	15:20	16:12	150:19		154:23	proposals [3]	62:5	purchased [1]	77:5
pressing [1]	185:13	16:14 21:17	16:16 21:19	16:22 35:6	154:24	158:7	158:20 162:12	62:8 208:12		purifying [1]	192:19
presume [1]	77:21	1	67:3	68:15			162:19	propose [2]	121:8	purpose [2]	5:21
pretend [1]	79:12	69:5	69:20	70:3	162:24	163:13	164:15	168:23		162:5	
pretty [16]	4:19		70:20	83:20		167:13		proposed [5]	52:13	purposes [7]	33:23
25:4 29:7	88:13		85:10 86:9	85:18 86:15	168:19	169:5 178:16	169:16	77:3 97:7 208:9	207:17	36:23 77:23	78:14
93:6 123:9	129:19		88:23	89:15	180:21	184:18		proposes [2]	52:15	123:4 146:10	
130:19 133:21	164:15		90:9	90:25	185:8	185:18		168:19	32.13	pursue [3]	62:23
165:19 168:9 192:3 192:23	189:9 198:19	98:14	98:15	100:5	199:3	200:6	201:11	proposing [1]	63:20	102:23 189:7 pursued [1]	65:9
prevalent [1]	94:7		107:1	111:5 112:24	204:5	207:17		proposition [1]		pursuing [1]	
previously [3]	34:11		112:23	112:24	209:5	209:11 214:6	210:24	pros [3] 79:8	140:16	purview [1]	112:11 210:14
77:18 126:22	34:11	123:8	123:10	127:11	prograi		[9]	140:20		<b>push</b> [1] 158:1	210.14
price [4] 41:25	145:9	134:14		141:7	74:22	76:17	81:25	prospect [1]	203:2		17.0
145:11 145:12	1 1017			151:19	84:20	85:1	85:4	prospective [1]		put [29] 13:3 38:13 38:16	17:8 39:7
pricing [2]	145:5	151:23 152:16		152:9 154:25	88:4	209:4	209:16	prospects [1]	129:18	41:16 43:3	68:6
213:6				168:22	program		14:21	protect [1]	160:4	69:23 79:21	85:23
primarily [4]	79:2	179:20	189:13	192:19	15:2 19:20	19:8 23:24	19:8 24:1	protected [1]	197:18	86:2 115:5	116:16
156:19 204:25	211:9	199:24		200:5	27:7	27:18	29:8	protecting [1]	159:22	116:17 144:8 151:7 156:6	151:7 157:19
primary [1]	151:23	1	203:20	22.20	31:2	31:3	31:17	protection [3]	2:15	161:19 173:16	
principle [3]	120:13	process 83:21	ies [3] 148:9	32:20	34:11	34:13	35:14	27:25 28:24		177:24 179:19	180:6
170:12 170:21	12.5	produce		24:6	47:10 50:9	47:12 73:10	47:21 73:18	protections [1]	111:2	182:12 198:22	201:4
principles [11] 120:7 120:8	13:5 139:14	199:25	~ [*]	2-1.U	73:20	85:12	99:4	proven [2]	49:11	puts [1] 55:22	
139:14 139:17		produce	e <b>d</b> 121	13:15	118:22	138:8	147:20	64:19		putting [9]	17:13
140:4 140:5	147:25	164:15	— L-J			155:11		provide [21]	5:1	44:4 53:15 81:6 85:21	72:9 128:20
157:7		produce	es [1]	110:15		157:16 161:20		7:7 11:2 27:24 28:25	20:5 70:20	147:7 177:21	140.40
		]			101,14	101.20	101.23	21.27 20.23	10.20		

BDAC MEET	TING			Condense	eIt™		ouzzled - relat	tionship
puzzled [1]	86:19	quote [3]	77:10	reality [1]	101:2	recently [4] 151:25	162:12 180:20	
Pyle [9] 3:15	54:9	77:12 208:13		realize[1]	26:1	152:3 164:12 182:23	refine [4]	200:5
112:21 168:13	169:22	Raab[11]	2:13	realized	215:17	recess [1] 126:14	200:6 201:20	209:20
171:3 214:14	214:18	61:24 104:18	105:25			recessed [1] 217:14	refined [3]	13:11
215:7		106:12 108:10	171:2	reallocated [1]			15:25 200:19	13.11
qualifications	(1)	171:5 186:22	188:14	reallocation [2]	j 123:4	recipe [1] 193:15		11.0
125:2	[*]	209:7		162:4		reclamation [5] 3:7	refinement [9]	
1	1045	radio [1] 129:8		really [108]	6:23	28:18 37:9 37:18	15:24 38:2	85:5
qualified[1]	194:7		110.16	6:23 8:24	9:4	39:10	85:10 86:4	88:6
qualify [1]	202:25	raise [4] 84:25	113:16	9:7 9:9	22:14	recognition [4] 76:22	200:4 201:1	
qualities [1]	28:9	146:1 178:17		24:24 25:24	39:6	113:17 113:22 140:19	refining [2]	17:12
quality [51]	13:25	raised [11]	6:24	42:17 43:20	49:11	recognize [5] 69:22	86:6	
14:3 14:4	14:5	62:5 79:25	85:11	52:4 60:6	67:2	70:6 84:12 117:8	reflect [6]	31:6
20:12 20:24	22:5	95:4 121:23		68:18 69:24	71:21	129:21	71:18 87:3	136:20
23:24 25:7	27:8	157:5 157:6	165:10	71:25 72:1	72:9		172:6 211:25	
27:11 28:11	31:6	182:3		75:13 75:16	76:7	recognized [1] 182:25	reflected [2]	72:10
36:4 51:3	60:7	raises [2]	80:4	79:13 83:11	84:1	recognizing [3] 11:15	90:16	72.10
78:13 80:18	81:19	80:22		84:2 85:19	88:1	112:25 153:7	1	06.04
83:13 92:20	99:25	raising [4]	42:17	88:2 88:15	88:25	recommend [2] 122:22	reflection [2]	86:24
100:9 100:25		45:13 85:9	171:9	89:25 103:5	104:20	147:9	153:16	
	118:16	1	111.5	105:6 105:11	105:14	recommendation [3]	reflects [4]	21:18
124:19 125:6	139:16	ran [1] 176:14		105:18 108:14	108:22	57:9 62:15 62:18	153:18 172:7	208:1
139:18 143:13		Randy [1]	131:16	109:11 112:14			refuges [1]	36:23
159:5 170:15		range [21]	20:8	118:15 118:16		recommendations [6]	regard [11]	37:5
173:7 174:10		22:18 22:19	23:16	128:4 128:10	128:14	69:24 147:24 148:2 153:9 203:14 212:6	101:23 102:3	102:24
192:8 192:24		28:1 28:6	29:21	128:21 129:13	132:8		103:2 103:17	103:23
207:20 216:4	216:9	53:11 59:2	60:17	132:11 134:4	134:10	recommended [1]	103.2 103.17	162:7
216:9 216:10		64:18 72:23	72:25	138:7 140:5	140:5	212:16	207:23	102.7
216:13 218:21	210.11	88:4 88:12	89:8	145:14 148:15	148:20	recommending [1]		F.C. 1
	_	105:18 121:9	166:23	148:24 149:1	154:20	57:16	regarding [9]	56:1
quantifiable [2	:]	179:25 189:15			157:9	reconciling [1] 150:15	78:23 79:5	105:17
118:11 202:8		ranges [2]	21:10	157:11 157:23	158:1	reconfiguration [1]	151:25 170:6	170:11
quantification	l [2]	21:11	21.10	161:17 161:23	162:14		184:9 210:13	
159:8 159:9			177.10	164:22 167:8	168:16	21:14	regardless [2]	44:3
quantification	<b>is</b> [1]	rarely [1]	177:10	175:21 175:22	176:2	reconfiguring [1]	119:22	
158:17		rate [5] 18:2	59:25	176:23 183:1	183:10	22:24	regards [1]	172:5
quantified [1]	158:15	78:4 175:10	183:17	185:5 186:12	187:22	reconstruct [1] 30:21	region [3]	123:11
quantify [3]		rather [9]	11:11	187:24 188:22	189:2	record [7] 5:21	173:8 173:9	120.11
89:6 208:7	41:10	43:15 62:14	73:18	189:4 189:16	190:1	6:10 15:21 68:21	regional [1]	28:2
1		77:4 86:15	130:20	197:3 197:17	198:1	68:25 75:4 134:17		
quantities [1]	121:9	189:18 203:24		198:11 202:23	203:17	l .	registration [2]	4:17
quantity [1]	192:25	rationale [2]	22:13	203:18 205:3	205:4	recover [2] 29:22	5:5	
quarrel [1]	81:6	137:18	22.15	210:17 211:8	212:17	94:10	regrettable [1]	78:24
_	138:4			213:7 213:15		rectify [1] 173:12	regulation [1]	211:10
quarters [1]		rattle [1] 173:5		realtime [13]	33:15	recycling [2] 35:3	regulatory [6]	
quasi-natural	[1]	RE [1] 1:3		49:3 49:7	49:10	38:11		43:25
32:20		reach [2]	134:8	49:12 59:21	63:9	red[1] 113:18	44:20 52:8 183:18 212:20	62:20
quest [1]	89:14	190:4		63:11 63:14	63:23	redirect [1] 120:9		
questioned [1]	9:9	reached [1]	128:9	63:25 64:7	64:9		Reike [1]	131:20
questions [36]	16:21	reaching [3]	108:19	rearing [1]	23:3	redirection[1] 120:10	Reike's [1]	134:3
26:24 33:4	47:22	141:15 188:25	100.19	•		REDMOND [8]	reinforce [2]	151:16
54:6 59:7	62:4	1	50.00	reason [10]	44:19	2:22 82:20 85:13	152:14	<b>.</b>
64:13 68:20	62:4 69:4	react [3] 59:22	59:22	44:20 44:20	60:2	104:19 161:1 210:11	reiterate [8]	46:23
72:16 74:18	77:19	60:5		120:6 132:14	100:10	215:5 215:9	88:8 107:13	
79:8 91:2	121:1	reaction [3]	115:25	174:17 180:19		reduce [16] 14:6	126:25 162:3	187:12
125:1 126:22		143:1 143:3		reasonable [5]		18:18 40:6 40:8	196:19	~~,,,2
137:16 137:21		read [10] 20:15	41:25	109:7 154:25	155:4	41:20 76:25 77:11		101.00
	185:23	42:25 44:22	75:15	198:17		92:11 124:10 125:8	rejected [1]	191:22
201:23 205:24		117:4 122:22		reasonably [2]	5:11	125:15 125:20 125:22	relate [s]	66:4
206:20 207:6	207:8	130:1 130:10		109:8		144:12 149:16 150:3	115:23 130:14	154:20
210:7 214:13		ready [4]	11:2	reasons [4]	88:16	reduced [2] 39:12	198:16	
214:18 216:14		74:24 126:6	135:13	119:18 134:2	142:7	125:14	related [10]	54:13
quick [4]	7:25	real [25] 17:20	18:3	reassessment		reducing [7] 39:15	58:25 59:6	60:4
22:8 29:11	7.23 214:18	39:20 40:14	40:24	95:6	. <del>-</del> J	40:13 63:12 77:6	70:18 73:24	102:5
		41:25 66:5	69:11		104.01	77:8 124:14 144:18	119:13 124:4	138:9
quickly [3]	85:25	69:11 73:3	90:5	rebuttal [1]	134:21	•	relates [4]	25:15
140:16 165:19		93:16 95:25	100:21	recap[1]	10:21	reductions [1] 39:16	58:20 102:5	215:14
Quinn [1]	131:15	107:3 107:6	110:11	receive [1]	78:9	reemphasize [1]	relating [1]	59:4
quite [13]	61:7	121:19 149:21		received [6]	4:15	13:18		
75:13 93:15	106:4	167:20 176:8	177:1	21:17 75:9	122:19	refer [1] 162:11	relationship [6	
121:4 121:17		197:5 205:7	111.1	160:16 182:6	122.17	reference [2] 37:7		214:22
	154:18	realistic [1]	176.00		151.00	208:16	215:3 215:6	
154:19 190:2	190:2	104118110[1]	176:22	recent [3] 152:18 208:21	151:22	refers [3] 46:12		
		<u> </u>				40:12	<u> </u>	
DODELY D. 0		CIATES DEI						Daga 20

responsible [1] 113:4

responsibilities [3]

responsibility [1]

71:16 204:7

52:9

74:20

135:18

71:7

87:15

representative [1]

107:21 107:22 108:13

101:16

, W.

Index Page 21

98:21

30:9

78:9

returned [1]

revenue [4]

reversal [1]

reverse [3]

196:3

196:3

52:15

77:6

30:12

156:4

195:25

206:12

32:19

150:6

55:17

94:25

173:17 174:14

riverine [2]

road [4] 70:23

77:6

95:2

30:12

70:24

salient [1]

salmon [3]

174:15 174:18

181:10 181:14

salt [4] 78:8

BDAC MEET	ΓING			Condense	eIt <sup>™</sup>			sampling -	snakes
sampling [1]	107:16	136:15 136:21	153:6	seeing [9]	66:25	service [6]	25:17	sign [3] 5:20	5:23
San [38] 2:13	30:16	184:10 186:3	186:7	101:1 123:5	142:16	38:15 55:8	115:17	127:8	
30:20 31:17	31:20	194:5		144:5 147:3	154:2	204:23 215:3		signatories [2]	132:18
31:21 32:11	33:2	scratching [1]	99:22	154:6 217:10		Services [1]	55:6	134:21	
45:13 46:10	46:14	screen [7]	22:20	seek [1] 76:9		serving [2]	128:25	signed [6]	38:3
77:4 77:15	91:20	54:25 55:5	55:22	seeking [2]	149:19	178:12		128:16 130:1	132:16
94:20 94:25	97:10	64:23 65:6	143:8	208:6		session [4]	69:11	215:16 217:7	
110:25 117:13 141:10 146:15		screened [2]	21:23	seem [5] 80:13	137:23	87:11 126:19	141:12	significance [5]	
172:9 172:14		22:12		148:15 215:15	215:20	sessions [2]	79:3		127:3
173:13 173:17		screening [16]	23:1	sees [2] 100:5	126:2	182:3		183:2 183:3	
174:14 177:14	178:22	30:4 30:13	49:25	seismic [1]	195:11	set [21] 6:10	11:17	significant [12]	
180:21 181:15	182:8	50:5 50:7	51:5	select[1]	59:8	47:3 48:7	52:17	50:4 57:19	90:4
182:24 218:2	218:17	52:5 52:10 52:14 52:22	52:12 54:10	selected [1]	60:1	52:22 53:16	57:10	127:1 128:6 141:15 141:18	134:13
sanctions [2]	212:20	54:20 56:1	116:2	selenium [2]	172:25	59:5 73:16	80:10	150:16 215:17	143.10
213:3		screenings [2]	50:2	173:5	1 / 2.23	81:11 82:25 85:18 94:9	85:15 97:20	significantly [	,,
sand[1] 32:14		54:24	30.2	self-evaluatio	<b>n</b> rn	121:6 159:23	208:20	18:5 49:13	76:24
Santa [1]	2:18	screens [9]	54:12	211:11	[-]	209:20	_000	signing [4]	72:3
sat [2] 58:4	116:24	54:12 54:19	55:1	self-evident [1	123:9	sets [2] 206:4	206:5	131:12 133:24	
satisfactory [1]	131:23	55:11 64:14	64:16	self-regulation		setting [4]	23:17	silence [3]	58:4
satisfied [1]	179:13	64:19 65:1	-	211:11	~ [+]	157:17 208:13	208:16	58:7 58:8	50.1
satisfies [1]	85:8	scrutiny [1]	79:4	Selkirk [11]	3:4	setup [1]	71:4	silent [1]	50:12
satisfies [1]	84:24	sea [2] 150:11		37:4 66:22	101:23	several [20]	26:6	silt [1] 173:5	50,12
• • •		seasons [1]	176:6	102:1 102:18	102:21	33:21 41:15	47:17	similar [1]	122.5
save [2] 2:13	174:22	seat[1] 211:19	0.0	108:7 136:5	136:7	51:11 52:20	54:18		123:5
saved [3]	103:11		50.00	207:11		64:6 82:9	106:1	simplify[1]	120:21
214:24 214:25	215 6	second [18] 54:21 60:16	52:23 60:20	sell [3] 44:12	95:17	106:2 108:16		simplistic [1]	127:21
saving [1]	215:2	65:2 65:14	73:6	97:9			139:11	simply [11]	12:1
savings [3]	125:18	112:12 119:9	119:24	seller [2]	95:21	162:25 187:1	212:17	20:23 54:22	57:15
214:22 215:17	07.10	137:13 138:1	155:2	97:6		216:7	20.10	59:5 65:8 83:7 93:1	72:22 125:14
<b>Saw</b> [3] 8:22 127:6	27:12	158:7 171:16	173:4	sellers [1]	97:8	shaded [1]	30:12	127:3	123.17
1	40.0	178:19 208:15		Senate [3]	8:15	shallower [1]	32:15	single [5]	55:10
<b>says</b> [12] 39:9 40:12 40:15	40:3 41:25	secondary [1]	158:12	127:7 127:17		share [3] 111:16	131:6	66:15 87:4	118:25
61:10 63:7	86:20	Secondly [2]	203:8	Senator [6]	98:9	133:14		119:3	
94:7 125:6	171:16	212:15		98:16 128:23	131:6	shared [1]	96:19	sink [1] 26:9	
181:8		Secretary [4]	11:5	131:12 132:17		<b>shelf</b> [1] 55:23		sit [2] 57:16	90:11
SB [25] 8:15	72:4	71:5 98:9	98:16	send [3] 87:25	90:3	shift [3] 94:22	112:14	sitting [1]	169:18
98:6 98:10	98:12	section [2]	46:22	176:4		144:25		situation [6]	38:23
99:8 107:6	107:12	56:11		sending [2]	9:5	short [7] 12:13	37:16	39:4 58:22	66:12
126:21 127:2	127:6	sections [1]	207:21	197:7	00.5	44:13 94:20	117:4	176:11 192:23	00.12
127:11 130:22 141:25 142:7	141:13 170:13	sector [7]	12:9	sends [1]	90:5	129:4 193:20		Six [8] 12:20	16:12
	196:16	12:10 37:24	37:25	sense [18]	13:23	shortages [1]	39:16	16:12 63:6	189:2
196:22 197:10	197:12	38:20 123:12		54:4 75:2 82:21 83:17	80:13 83:19	shorthand [4]	218:3	193:8 206:8	206:20
197:14 202:6		sectors [1]	108:10	84:1 87:1	105:8	218:6 218:8	218:16	sizable [1]	178:11
scale [20]	29:25	sediments [1]	32:24	107:23 129:6	184:15	show [4] 9:25	40:6	size [8] 23:15	45:18
31:25 32:19	33:3	see [71] 4:10	6:9	185:18 186:13	198:11	47:23 115:12	17.14	53:24 55:14	58:18
34:1 52:15	62:5	7:11 8:24 16:21 19:9	16:14 31:20	206:19 213:23		showed [2] 133:24	17:14	112:6 147:8	171:23
63:20 82:15	90:20	34:22 38:21	40:14	sensing [1]	99:16	showing [1]	19.22	sized [1] 147:10	
93:8 113:1 147:25 148:6	142:24 148:14	43:2 46:10	67:8	sensitive [4]	18:13	1	18:22	sizes [1] 137:17	
148:23 149:24		69:16 73:1	81:22		196:18	shown [3] 20:23 22:5	20:15	sizing [3]	67:25
150:20		83:9 88:7	88:10	sensitivity [1]	100:22	shows [2]	10.6	137:14 147:5	
scarce [1]	157:9	88:19 98:5	101:18	sent [2] 6:6	198:21	86:4	10:6	skeptical [1]	134:1
scenarios [3]	60:5	105:13 110:18 113:5 114:11	111:13	sentence [4]	42:18	shut [4] 63:17	94:8	<b>skin</b> [1] 173:22	
60:8 105:19	· <del>-</del>	120:3 121:6	121:8	43:14 43:21	44:22	94:15 97:1	J 1.0	skipped [1]	128:17
schedule [1]	28:23		125:23	separate [4]	32:4	shutdowns [1]	94:11	slighted [1]	198:9
scheduled [2]	6:4	125:23 126:1	126:10	119:16 120:2	120:17	shutting [1]	64:3	slightly [1]	187:19
207:13		130:25 135:14		September [2]	6:3	shuttle [1]	134:9	slop [1] 39:23	-
scientific [1]	171:9		149:23	67:8		side [11] 17:3	19:25	slough[1]	174:24
Scoonover [1]	215:25	150:18 152:8 156:3 157:4	153:5 157:18	series [1]	86:23	<b>\$100</b> [11] 17:3 42:23 84:10	19:25 102:24	small [4]	34:5
scope [3]	71:24	157:20 158:24		serious [6]	55:24	104:4 120:3	138:22	52:12 107:16	
148:14 165:1	<b>. – .</b>		165:17	77:14 97:6	173:24	143:19 160:11	198:2	smaller [3]	30:6
scoping [6]	13:12	168:3 168:13	171:12	176:8 176:9	55.64	sides [2] 128:22	185:12	53:24 189:15	20.0
13:13 13:20	13:22	176:23 178:25		seriously [1]	55:24	Sierra [3]	191:8	smart [1]	168:6
35:7 92:17		184:7 189:9	193:16	served [2]	4:19	192:9 192:10	1.0	smile [1]	116:16
Scott [9] 136:2	136:4	193:18 194:23 197:25 201:25		134:10	10-10	Sierras [1]	32:15	snakes [1]	173:6
		171.23 201.23	203,20	serves [1]	18:18			OHUMOS [1]	113.0

102:2

124:4

162:6

200:8

specificity [2] 121:12

95.12

156:6

180:4

137:10

10:9

specifics [1]

specified [1]

spectrum [1]

speech [1]

SPECTATOR [3]

102:8

118:15

103:23

136:11

164:2

208:24

62:19

59:1

102:12

84:6

98:9

`r~<u>\$</u>

86:1

49:10

68:20

83:16

88:9

100:9

130:14

136:24

158:3

189:6

195:4

212:1

213:18

203:16

55:10

83:3

88:1

99:21

128:21

135:21

157:21

166:14

194:21

203:16

211:18

212:23

69:6

83:21

98:7

100.11

135:15

153:6

159:6

190:6

197:1

210:14

212:19

Index Page 23

208:1

40:16

97:16

62:13

199:11

211:14

strengths [2]

stream [6]

streams [1]

Streets [1]

7:9

30:23

81:24

16:12

158:16

118:13

88.9

209:18

45:10

196:3

STRELOW [8] 2:17

62:25

169:20 197:24 199:5

32:16

84:10

32:12

1:11

167:5

211:2

stakeholder [2] 147:7

67:9

109:6

71.7

176:11 188:19

147:9

174:20

37:1

81:12

stakeholders [10]

189:11

56:22

108:20

147:23

216:11

stance [1]

stand

81:14

standard [2]

Stearns [1]

steep [1] 177:9

step [9] 12:20

stepping [1]

steps [1] 37:21

32:11

85:19

141:15

stem [4] 30:3

31:20

73:18

93:4

205:23

stems [1]

BDAC MEETING	ł	<b>CondenseIt</b> <sup>™</sup>		strenuously - third
strenuously [1] 162:4	substantially [3]	100:1 100:10 100:13	50:10 52:13 60:13	<b>TENNIS</b> [1] 109:25
stress [2] 59:12	1 55 11 105 0 105 00	100:15 101:2 104:6	60:21 60:23 63:9	term [9] 40:24 47:16
147:16	substitute [1] 155:22	110:16 113:7 118:17	63:16 63:16 66:18	104:24 158:25 160:9
<b>stretch</b> [1] 209:1		124:10 139:20 139:23	82:13 144:16 144:25	160:12 163:12 191:11
strictly [1] 25:6	succeed [1] 133:2	144:1 144:11 144:12	146:7 146:18 147:21	196:8
		144:19 145:15 170:15	148:17 149:8 150:9	terms [42] 10:22
strived [1] 8:8	successful [2] 46:24	175:12 175:14 175:19 176:3 176:22 177:2	156:25 178:8 181:13   183:1 184:4 187:5	11:5 11:19 14:22
<b>striving</b> [2] 9:5		177:17 177:22 177:24	199:4 204:20 215:13	15:1 21:4 30:3
12:6	successfully [1]	179:1 198:2 198:5	systematically [1]	32:9 36:15 37:13
strong [9] 38:18		198:10 215:1 215:1	188:20	43:11 55:16 71:20
39:1 70:14 90:5	such [17] 27:16	support [13] 35:24	1 -	80:8 81:18 84:11
115:11 210:2 210:4 211:16 213:12	27:19 27:22 28:15 36:23 67:9 76:1	67:9 107:15 129:16	<b>systems</b> [4] 46:13 66:7 161:7 161:8	87:19 95:19 96:3 103:16 110:6 110:7
	0711 11000 11610	134:19 141:17 180:2		110:13 126:11 138:11
stronger[1] 213:8	149.0 161.6 165.4	180:8 180:10 183:25	T [2] 115:25 207:2	139:18 143:21 144:23
<b>strongly</b> [1] 70:13	190:9 192:5 217:10	208:18 210:24 215:25	table [6] 4:17 5:5	145:5 145:20 151:15
structural [1] 146:1	1 218:8	supportable [1] 209:11	42:4 66:3 98:3	151:24 152:3 156:20
structure [13] 10:23		supported [1] 127:18	133:21	157:6 168:20 190:3
18:23 19:3 67:6	176:16	supporting [4] 28:2	tables [1] 189:3	190:11 204:19 204:23
110:19 155:7 161:5	sufficient m 55:22	28:3 113:5 180:7	tacit[1] 78:17	205:2 206:18
169:8 169:8 184:1	J 100·2 206·21	supportive [2] 135:17	tail[1] 190:10	thank [78] 4:6
185:20 201:19 206:1	Suggest ter 25:0	164:17	takes [4] 32:8 38:19	7:15 7:19 7:23
structured [2] 26:25	42:7 118:9 119:14	1	151:19 195:4	31:15 34:8 34:9
62:22	120:22 140:9	<b>supports</b> [2] 98:25	taking [12] 34:14	57:12 61:22 67:19
structures [3] 200:2	2 suggested [4] 88:15	<b>1</b>	36:8 37:22 38:17	68:12 70:25 71:2
209:4 209:17	134:25 135:1 212:17	<b>suppose</b> [5] 88:17 89:5 133:12 139:23	44:19 55:24 61:7	72:13 79:20 82:7 82:19 88:11 89:11
Stu [4] 54:8 112:2	0 suggesting [4] 86:12	89:5 133:12 139:23 187:4	120:19 157:22 198:8	82:19 88:11 89:11 99:13 101:12 104:17
167:4 168:12	93:17 158:15 208:23		214:8 214:21	105:23 107:18 111:18
<b>STUART</b> [1] 3:15	suggestion [3] 139:23	supposedly [1] 132:4	talks [2] 73:17 94:18	116:6 116:7 116:11
<b>studied</b> [1] 76:10	188:2 212:21	surface [1] 38:10	target [1] 71:21	116:11 117:19 117:24
studies [1] 41:15		<b>surfaces</b> [1] 129:18	targets [1] 158:20	117:25 118:2 120:23
study [7] 72:25	Dag Secretario [2] 1 12.2	<b>surprise</b> [1] 100:17	task [4] 112:19 133:5	121:20 122:11 123:13
122:20 122:20 182:3		surreal [1] 130:18	150:7 165:17	123:14 123:20 126:3
182:7 203:22 204:2		<b>surround</b> [1] 55:3	team [5] 28:15 51:20	126:4 127:15 134:23
studying [1] 193:1		surrounding [1] 152:18	71:14 87:8 187:19	135:11 136:4 140:11 141:2 141:6 151:1
stuff [7] 4:15 11:8	summarized [3] 6:12	survival [1] 44:19	team's [1] 54:4	151:1 151:2 152:24
81:18 81:21 130:		SUSAN [3] 1:20	technical [7] 54:2	153:20 162:1 162:8
130:20 133:14	summary [8] 136:19	218:3 218:24	108:17 138:17 168:22	170:25 175:1 175:2
<b>stunning</b> [1] 160:1	1	sustain [3] 165:17	216:4 216:8 216:14	180:14 180:15 181:16
sub-alternative [1]	180:20 183:23 186:4	166:2 183:19	technically [1] 133:12	181:17 184:5 187:11
77:8	194:3			193:1 193:2 193:25
sub-alternatives [3]	<b>summer</b> [5] 77:6	sustainable [3] 149:10 150:2 150:15	technicians [1] 85:15	194:1 197:22 199:16
75:20 75:21 76:10		1	technique [4] 49:5	201:24 207:5 210:6
sub-group [1] 103:2	07:12	sustained [2] 165:7	49:11 49:14 84:9	214:11 215:22 216:23 217:1 217:11
	Danaman rees 0.5		techniques [2] 92:9	1
sub-options [1] 72:24	6.17 40.18 75.6	swamps [1] 148:18	208:19	thanks [3] 115:12
sub-surface [1] 173:	107.1 107.1 100.1	synergy[1] 31:1	technology [2] 211:25	152:23 210:9
<b>sub-work</b> [1] 216:8		synthesis [1] 70:2	212:4	themes [1] 195:13
<b>subject</b> [10] 13:1:		synthesize[1] 69:1	Ted[1] 108:12	themselves [3] 116:1
14:14 36:13 78:2:		system [88] 10:8	teeth [1] 76:7	119:10 211:11
149:18 168:13 171:	_	11:20 11:22 12:8	temperature [2] 97:15	theoretical [4] 66:9
172:6 175:6 191:	Dependent [1] 100:20	14:5 15:6 15:8	169:19	66:11 171:13 176:7
subjected [1] 79:4	supplementing [1]	15:10 15:12 15:13	temporarily [1] 75:7	theory [1] 176:1
<b>submit</b> [1] 150:2	1	15:13 15:14 18:12	temporary [9] 48:13	thereafter[1] 218:7
submitted [3] 21:20		18:13 18:14 18:18 18:20 19:2 19:5	48:24 92:10 93:14	thereby [1] 76:24
56:19 79:25	124:22	19:11 19:13 19:15	93:21 96:5 125:11	therefore [4] 39:23
subscribes [1] 153:	4 <b>supplies</b> [16] 30:1	19:19 19:21 20:2	143:23 143:23	40:16 90:21 126:7
subsequent [1] 48:12	31:9 34:25 35:15	20:4 20:9 20:11	ten [13] 4:5 13:11	thereof [1] 218:11
subsequently [3]	38:7 38:9 41:2	20:21 20:25 21:3	13:11 27:13 36:6	they've [4] 32:6
14:6 15:16 164:0	48:19 111:6 113:14	21:5 21:10 21:11	128:14 128:18 128:21	100:23 100:24 192:1
subsets [1] 190::	1 144:21 144:21 109:0	21:14 22:4 22:16	167:23 178:1 198:18 204:12 216:2	thin [1] 100:21
subsidence [2] 28:2:	173.22 277.2	23:3 23:11 23:20		thinking [12] 57:2
150:6		23:23 25:1 26:14	tend [3] 14:13 88:13	59:11 91:22 92:7
subsidies [1] 62:20	18:18 31:2 32:3 34:15 38:5 38:5	26:16 26:20 28:12 30:20 32:10 33:2	105:13	103:15 106:18 123:6
	40:7 42:11 42:15	39:10 39:23 42:8	tended [1] 199:23	149:25 160:6 161:23
<b>substantial</b> [9] 31:1 45:12 45:14 61:8	42:16 47:24 47:25	43:18 43:22 44:4	tendency [1] 195:4	166:23 171:11
63:15 64:8 72:6	49:20 49:22 76:25	44:5 44:13 44:14	tends [4] 14:13	thinks [1] 87:18
127:18 167:11	78:2 78:5 95:14	44:17 45:15 49:19	14:20 191:25 192:19	third [14] 22:7
				<u> </u>
PARTAIR & AC	SOCIATES DEPOSIT	ION DEPODTEDS		Index Page 24

67:24

Tom's [2]

21:10

21:11

Index Page 25

unintended [1] 9:8

43:21

type [12] 18:2

treatment [3]

28:8

United   19	BDAC MEET	ΓING			Condens	eIt™				unit	t - week
United   19	unit [2] 18:4	181:21	21:19 25:4	25:6	variable [2]	15:4	13:25	14:2	14:4	124:3 124:10	124:15
1008   115:5   115:16   25:22   27:19   27:20   27:19   27:20   115:21   27:20   27:19   27:20   115:21   27:20   27		29:19	25:17 25:18	25:19	1		14:7	15:6	15:13	124:19 124:20	125:6
					variation [2]	104:7					125:12
			I .		166:14		l .				
	<b>units</b> [1] 66:4				variations [1]	47:12					
162:5	unless [2]	117:8			varies [2]	18:1					
	162:5				18:5						
	unquote [1]	208:13	1		variety [4]	92:9					
Universe   107-22   108-29   131-39						203:13		26:3			145:9
13315   13414   13415   1341					various [11]	13:21					
		.^.1	I .				l .				
		21.23					l				
			210:21 210:23			190:4					
		131:19				1015					
											152:12
5.23   6:10   6:24   7:15			213:19 213:20	214:5		59:15		35:18		155:20 155:20	155:23
Start   Star				215:18	<b>vast</b> [1] 148:17		l				
11:18   12:8   14:1											
			urbans [1]	25:10		62:20					
	15:9 15:19	17:9	urge [1] 188:5		_						
			urged [1]	131:25	view [7] 53:19						
			_			131:23					
1902   1903   1904   1905   1905   1905   1906											
					viewed [1]		38:12	38:24			
1882   1882   1882   1882   1882   1883   1883   1883   1882   1902   1924									39:19		
65:1   68:2   74:5   76:20   191:1   20:5   57:20   191:1   20:5   191:1   20:1   20:2			í .		•	55:4					
1911   200:5   1912   200:5   2014   2012   2014   2012   2012   2014   2014				170:12							
Solid   Soli						169:20					
Signar   S				121:19		63:7					
19:34   99:2   99:2   99:34   99:10   99:10   99:10   99:10   195:21   195:23   196:4   196:4   196:5   196:8   196:4   196:5   196:8   196:4   196:5   196:8   196:4   196:5   196:8   196:5   196:8   196:4   196:5   196:8   196:4   196:5   196:8   196:5   196:8   196:4   196:5   196:8   196:4   196:5   196:8   196:4   196:5   196:8   196:4   196:5   196:8   196:4   196:5   196:8   196:4   196:5   196:8   196:4   196:5   196:8   196:4   196:5   196:8   196:4   196:5   196:8   196:4   196:5   196:8   196:6   197:20   203:14   193:16   193:24   193:24   193:24   193:24   193:24   193:24   193:25   193:3   113:24   113			211:23 213:10								
93:14 93:10 99:15 199:22 199:15 199:23 199:4 199:21 199:23 199:4 199:21 199:23 199:4 199:21 199:23 199:4 199:21 199:23 199:4 199:21 199:23 199:4 199:21 199:23 199:23 199:4 199:21 199:21 199:23 199:4 199:21 199:21 199:23 199:3 199:23 199:3 199:23 199:3 199:23 199:3 199:23 199:3 199:23 199:3 199:23 199:3 19					vital [1] 134:10						
106.16   106.24   106.25   196.8   196.6   197.20   203.14   213.6   23.14   23.14   23.15   23.14   23.14   23.15   23.14   23.14   23.15   23.14   23.14   23.15   23.14   23.14   23.14   23.14   23.14   23.14   23.14   23.15   23.14					voice [1]	169:17	44:12				
112:11   112:13   114:9   196:14   197:20   213:6   197:20   210:21   117:12   125:1   133:24   135:2   139:15   139:22   139:15   139:22   139:15   139:22   139:15   139:22   139:15   139:22   139:15   139:22   147:16   156:4   156:19   157:8   151:14   152:21   157:8   158:20   159:19   164:8   168:15   169:24   172:13   175:19   164:8   169:24   172:13   175:19   164:8   169:24   172:13   175:19   164:8   169:24   172:13   175:19   177:8   177:16   177:22   180:22   215:13   187:29   195:6   197:12   180:22   215:13   187:29   195:6   197:12   158:22   181:12   203:15   187:29   195:6   197:12   158:22   181:12   203:15   188:22   181:12   203:15   188:23   196:24   172:15   173:8   173:9   173:8   173:9   183:18   183:25   196:24   173:9   111:1   173:8   173:9   183:18   183:25   196:24   173:9   111:1   173:8   173:9   183:18   173:9   183:18   173:9   183:18   173:9   183:18   173:9   183:18   173:9   183:18   173:9   183:18   173:9   183:18   173:9   183:18   173:9   173:11   173:8   173:9   173:14   173:8   173:9   173:14   173:8   173:9   173:14   173:8   173:9   173:14   173:8   173:9   173:14   173:8   173:9   173:15   173:14   173:8   173:9   173:15   173:16   173:15   173:16					volume [2]	25:16					196:10
114:20   115:3   115:24   213:6   21											
117:12   125:1   133:24   135:2   139:15   139:22   149:14   150:8   149:14   150:8   149:14   150:8   149:14   150:8   149:16   149:14   150:8   149:14   150:8   149:14   150:8   149:14   150:8   149:14   150:8   149:14   150:8   149:14   150:8   149:16   149:14   150:8   149:14   150:8   149:14   150:8   149:14   150:8   149:14   150:8   149:14   149:18   149:14   150:8   149:14   149:18   149:14   150:8   149:14   149:18   149:14   149				203:14	voluntarily m	92:10					
135:2   139:15   139:22   139:15   139:22   140:7   140:7   149:14   150:8   151:14   152:21   153:4   156:4   156:19   157:8   158:20   159:19   164:8   168:16   169:24   177:10   177:21   178:16   177:22   178:12   179:6   187:13   177:16   177:22   178:12   179:6   187:13   179:6   187:13   179:6   187:13   179:6   187:13   179:19   158:22   181:12   192:9   195:6   197:12   198:4   200:15				77.4	1						
140:7   149:14   150:8   142:6   142:9   147:18   151:14   152:21   153:4   153:4   156:4   156:9   157:8   158:20   159:19   164:8   49:20   49:21   78:3   49:20   49:21   49:20   49:20   49:21   49:20   49:20   49:20   49:21   49:20   49:20   49:20   49:20   49:20   49:20			06:11 120:11								
156:44   156:19   157:8   158:18   183:25   196:2   159:19   164:8   168:14   169:16   49:20   49:21   179:8   177:16   177:22   179:6   187:3   40:12   49:25   47:16   187:20   191:1   191:1   191:1   192:6   187:10   197:2   198:4   200:8   201:15   207:10   210:13   210:17   217:5   217:7   217:5   217:7   217:5   217:7   217:5   217:7   217:5   217:7   217:5   217:7   217:5   217:1   217:12   218:10											
18:20   159:19   164:8   49:20   49:21   78:3   7						129-25					
168:14   168:15   169:16   169:16   169:24   172:13   175:19   177:22   177:18   177:16   177:22   177:18   177:16   177:22   177:18   177:16   177:22   178:12   179:6   187:13   179:6   187:13   179:6   187:13   179:6   187:13   179:19   199:10   105:3   114:15   143:24   199:19   195:6   197:12   199:4   200:8   201:15   207:10   210:13   210:17   217:7   217:7   217:7   217:7   217:7   217:7   217:7   217:7   217:13   218:19   218:12   218:19							60:14	61:11	62:8	215:10 215:11	
169:24   172:13   175:19   177:20   177:20   177:21   177:22   177:10   177:21   1			1 40 00 10 04								
177:8   177:16   177:22   178:12   179:6   187:13   179:6   187:13   199:9   195:6   197:12   198:4   200:8   201:15   208:18   211:12   203:15   215:7   215:12						1]					
178:12   179:6   187:13   40:1   40:25   47:16   105:3   114:15   143:24   158:22   181:12   203:15   198:4   200:8   201:15   208:18   211:12   208:18   211:12   215:7   215:12   2			using [12]	14:25		22,10					216:10
187:20   197:1   197	178:12 179:6	187:13	40:1 40:25	47:16		22:19					170 10
198:4   200:8   201:15   208:18   211:12   215:7   215:12   215:12   215:12   217:7   217:5   217:7   217:5   217:7   217:6   217:6   217:6   217:6   217:6   217:7   217:5											172:13
207:10   210:13   210:17   215:12   215:12   215:17   215:12   215:17   215:12   215:17   217:5   217:7   217:5   217:7   217:5   217:7   217:5   217:7   217:6   217:5   217:7   217:5   217:7   217:6   217:5   217:7   217:5   217:7   217:6   217:5   217:7   217:5   217:7   217:6   217:5   217:7   21				203:15	1 -	40.0					07.00
215:17   215:12   215:12   215:12   215:12   217:7   217:7   217:7   217:7   217:7   217:7   217:7   217:8   217:7   217:7   217:7   217:8   217:7   217:8   217:7   217:8   217:7   217:8						47:7					
217:5   217:7	207:10 210:13	∠1U:1/ 215·12		3:4	i .	150.11	81:19	83:11	83:13		
upbeat [1]         127:8         updating [1]         127:8         wanting [1]         118:8         y4:15         94:20         94:21         watersheds [1]         30:1           upland [2]         148:18         valid [3] 61:9         135:16         wants [8]         68:20         94:15         94:20         94:21         watersheds [1]         30:1           upper [9]         21:3         Valley [16]         2:18         46:13         65:20         77:15         81:12         109:25         129:14         195:22         95:1         95:2         95:7         95:12         95:13         95:22         95:17         95:22         95:17         95:22         95:17         95:22         95:17         95:22         95:17         95:22         95:17         95:22         95:17         95:22         95:17         95:22         95:17         95:22         95:17         95:22         95:17         95:22         95:17         95:22         95:17         95:22         95:17         95:22         95:17         95:22         95:17         95:22         95:17         95:22         97:10         142:10         142:10         142:10         142:11         142:10         142:11         142:11         142:11         142:11         142:1		213.12	i								
updating [i]         211:24         valid [3] 61:9         135:16         wants [8]         68:20         94:22         94:23         94:25         watersheds [1]         30:1           upland [2]         148:18         164:23         Valley [16]         2:18         wants [8]         68:20         95:1         95:2         95:7         95:22         95:7         ways [12]         70:22           upper [9]         21:3         46:13         65:20         77:15         143:11         96:25         97:9         97:10         95:23         95:23         95:23         96:25         97:9         97:10         149:13 <td></td> <td>127-8</td> <td></td> <td>48:22</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>209:21</td>		127-8		48:22							209:21
valid				10515							
148:19   Valley [16]   2:18   109:25   129:13   138:21   138:21   143:11   143:11   143:14   178:18   195:11   164:19   172:17   137:14   178:18   195:11   164:19   172:17   178:6   178:9   178:11   178:16   178:11   178:11   178:11   178:11   178:11   178:11   178:11   178:11				135:16							
upper [9]         21:3         Valicy [16]         2:18         109:25         129:13         138:21         95:23         95:23         96:11         142:10         142:12         144:16           22:18         24:16         30:17         46:13         65:20         77:15         143:11         96:25         97:9         97:10         98:24         99:25         100:9         149:13		148:18		0.10							111:13
40:13   03:20   77:13   72:18   24:16   30:17   45:13   88:14   89:10   137:14   178:18   173:9   180:21   181:15   187:17   190:25   181:15   187:17   190:25   182:1   184   18:7   18:10   182:1   184:1   18:7   18:10   183:13   18:14   18:7   18:10   18:13   18:13   18:13   18:13   18:13   18:13   18:13   18:13   18:14   18:7   18:15   18:17   18:15   18:17   18:16   18:17   18:16   18:17   18:16   18:17   18:16   18:17   18:12   18:24   18:26   18:17   18:16   18:17   18:16   18:17   18:16   18:17   18:16   18:17   18:16   18:17   18:16   18:17   18:16   18:17   18:16   18:17   18:16   18:17   18:16   18:17   18:16   18:17   18:16   18:17   18:16   18:17   18:18   18:22   18:22   18:22   18:24   18:26   18:26   18:27   18:26   18:26   18:27		21.2				138:21	95:23	95:23	96:11	142:10 142:12	144:16
45:13 88:14 89:10 137:14 178:18  upset [1]						22.16	96:25			149:13 149:13	150:5
137:14 178:18											
upset [1]       192:16       181:15       187:17       190:25       Washington [1] 202:15       101:13		· · <del>-</del>				32:8					111:10
upstream [18]       19:5       value [12]       18:1       waste [2]       78:10       103:6       103:10       103:22       wear [1]       wear [1]       171:23         32:21       33:3       45:16       46:8       46:11       46:12       40:13       40:14       64:6       40:13       40:14       64:6       40:13       40:14       64:6       40:13       40:14       64:6       40:12       13:12       13:12       10:21       10:22       10:22       10:23       wearing [1]       172:3         55:15       148:6       176:25       69:22       69:22       69:22       valve [1]       34:20       2:7       2:9       2:11       113:22       117:14       117:21       Weber [2]       1:24         178:11       178:16       178:16       2:18       3:3       3:13       118:16       118:17       120:11       118:22		192:16				- 000 15					211:2
20:9 21:6 23:21 33:3 45:16 46:8 46:11 46:12 55:15 148:6 176:25 177:1 178:6 178:9 178:11 178:16 variability [2] 17:24 2:18 3:3 3:13 106:20 106:22 wear [1] 171:23 weather [1] 213:8 water [377] 2:2 113:7 113:14 113:20 water [2] 178:11 178:16 variability [2] 17:24 2:18 3:3 3:13 118:16 118:17 120:11 weaker [2] 17:14 17:21 218:22 weaker [377] 2:2 18:16 118:17 120:11 weaker [2] 1:24 218:22 weaker [377] 2:18 3:3 3:13 118:16 118:17 120:11 weaker [377] 2:18:22 weaker [377] 2:18:16 118:17 120:11 weaker [377] 2:18:24 218:22 weaker [377] 2:18:16 118:17 120:11 weaker [377] 2:18:16 118:17 120:11 weaker [377] 2:18:16 118:17 120:11 weaker [377] 2:18:18:16 118:17 120:11 weaker [377] 2:18:18 118:16 118:17 120:11 weaker [377] 2:18:18 118:16 118:17 120:11 weaker [377] 2:18:18:16 118:17 120:11 weaker [377] 2:18:18 118:16 118:17 120:11 weaker [377] 2:18:18 118:16 118:17 120:11 weaker [377] 2:18 118											
32:21 33:3 45:16 46:8 46:11 46:12 55:15 148:6 176:25 177:1 178:6 178:9 178:11 178:16  26:2 26:8 26:10 40:13 40:14 64:6  watchdog [1] 213:8 water [377] 2:2 178:11 178:16  water [377] 2:2 118:16 118:17 110:16 water [377] 2:2 118:16 118:17 120:11 wearing [1] 172:3  weather [1] 211:6  Weber [2] 1:24 218 3:3 3:13  18:16 118:17 120:11  wearing [1] 172:3  weather [1] 211:6  107:22 108:9 110:16  111:7 111:7 113:1  weather [1] 211:6  178:11 178:16 118:17 120:11			18:4 18:7			78:10				wear[1] 171:23	
46:8 46:11 46:12 69:22 69:22 water [377] 2:2 113:7 113:1 113:20 weather [1] 211:6 178:11 178:16 variability [2] 17:24 2:18 3:3 3:13 118:16 118:17 120:11 weather [1] 211:6 water [377] 2:2 118:16 118:17 120:11 weather [1] 211:6 water [377] 2:1 118:16 118:17 120:11 weather [1] 211:6 water [377] 2:1 118:16 118:17 120:11 weather [1] 211:6 water [377] 2:1 118:16 118:17 120:11 weather [1] 211:6 water [377] 2:1 118:16 118:17 120:11 weather [1] 211:6 water [377] 2:1 118:16 118:17 120:11 weather [1] 211:6 water [377] 2:1 118:16 118:17 120:11 weather [1] 211:6 water [377] 2:1 118:16 118:17 120:11 weather [1] 211:6 water [377] 2:1 118:16 118:17 120:11 weather [1] 211:6 water [377] 2:1 118:16 118:17 120:11 weather [1] 211:6 water [377] 2:1 118:16 118:17 120:11 water [377] 2:1 118:18 118:18 118:18 118:18 118:18 118:18 118:18 11										wearing [1]	172:3
55:15 148:6 176:25 177:1 178:6 178:9 valve[1] 34:20 2:7 2:9 2:11 113:7 113:14 113:20 Weber [2] 178:11 178:16 variability [2] 17:24 2:18 3:3 3:13 118:16 118:17 120:11 very key 4:16 207:14	46:8 46:11	46:12		64:6	_		111:7	111:7	113:1		
178:11 178:16			1								
1/6:11 1/6:10 variability [2] 17:24 2:18 3:3 3:13   116:10 116:1/ 120:11   week so 4:16 207:14		178:9									
urban [60] 21:19   83:16   3:14   3:13   11:14   122:10   123:3   123:23				17:24							207:14
	urban [60]	21:19	83:16		3:14 3:15	11:14	122:10	123:3	125:25		~01.1T

BDAC MEET	TING			Condens	eIt™			•
208:5		wondered [4]	22:11	year [16] 16:7	18:2			
weeks [3]	87:9	62:16 64:17	182:18	18:2 18:5	24:11			
183:16 187:1		wondering [3]	4:14	33:23 60:16 65:20 103:12	65:16			
weigh [1]	139:2	98:8 108:23			110:14 122:25			
weighed [2]	128:7	word [3] 40:21 183:5	180:22	177:23 177:24				
134:4		words [7]	9:13	year-round [2]	59:15			
weird[1]	130:19	9:17 137:1	138:13	59:25			l	
well-develope	(1) <b>D</b>	153:12 185:4	206:12	yearly [1]	25:15			
120:7 <b>well-known</b> [1]	176.4	workable [1]	206:22	years [27]	17:25			
	1 / 0:4	worked [4]	8:16	39:19 41:12	48:1			
west[1] 143:19	115.04	9:3 130:21	133:20	63:14 64:7 90:11 104:12	67:16 108:16		ı	
western [2] 178:22	115:24	workers [1]	67:1	110:10 110:10			ı	
Westlands [3]	95:22	works [1]	202:13	149:14 167:23			ı	
123:25 124:2	) J.LL	Workshop [27]		174:15 175:8	175:25		I	
wet [2] 176:5	205:4	8:20 8:21	13:6	176:5 177:22   178:4 180:3	177:25 180:9			
wetlands [8]	28:7	13:10 13:16 16:16 46:22	16:13 46:24	198:7 198:18	100.9			
30:12 30:18	77:14	47:19 50:19	51:18	yellow [1]	20:20	:	I	
80:6 80:8	80:17	51:19 56:12	56:20	yesterday [8]	112:1		I	
83:6		56:24 57:3	86:13	153:4 187:13	202:21		l	
Wheeler [1]	181:20	112:2 114:18 189:13 201:5	154:25 201:6	203:21 204:18	205:6			
whichever [1]	86:17	201:12 201:13	201.0	205:23	~		-	
whoa [1] 197:22		Workshops [10	116:8	yet [12] 6:5 71:25 76:3	56:12			
<b>whole</b> [30] 18:19 40:4	12:8 62:2	16:15 51:25	52:3	71:25 76:3 76:22 78:19	76:7 105:21		Į	]
63:8 73:23	74:19	79:2 86:6	106:1	165:23 191:19			l	
82:10 82:17	82:25	188:13 188:17		209:14			l	
83:22 95:9	102:24	world[1]	134:8	yield [10]	40:25		l	
112:5 112:8	112:12	worm[1]	191:25	41:3 41:11	42:8		l	
128:2 130:20 178:15 184:22		worried [1]	179:12	42:19 45:12 89:3 178:8	45:14 182:14		l	
194:11 195:12		worries [1]	43:3	yields [2]	45:21		l	
199:12 207:1	207:3	WOTTY [2]	43:1	110:20	13.21		I	
208:11 210:3		141:5	114.00	Zach [2] 205:11	205:16			
wider [2]	22:23	worshiped [1]	114:23	Zach's [1]	204:16			
22:24	107.7	worst [1] worth [6]	14:16	zone [2] 152:1	209:8			
widest [1]	127:7	<b>WOTH [6]</b> 17:20 81:16	10:5 133:5				-	
Wildlife [1]	55:6	134:6 216:20	100.0					
willing [8] 88:17 88:23	78:11 89:8	worthwhile [2]	81:21					
95:20 95:21	97:6	99:18					1	
178:23	- · · •	<b>wrap</b> [1] 53:10						
Wilson [1]	11:5	wrestling [1]	145:1					
win-win [1]	18:12	write [3] 17:16	61:20					
	171:4	74:24					1	
171:5		write-ups [1]	48:12					
window [1]	113:9	writing [4]	6:13					
wisdom [1]	69:23	6:14 79:21	173:16					
wise [1] 79:11		written [8] 9:19 43:11	9:17 132:11					
wish [5] 114:6	114:8	138:15 138:18					1	
171:11 171:18		151:8						
wishes [3] 123:15 217:8	95:16	wrong [2]	10:18				١	
within [12]	72:24	169:23					١	
76:8 100:22	101:2	wrote [3]	75:10				I	
125:5 156:20	166:16	116:23 130:6						
189:3 203:1	205:7	Yaeger [19]	25:3				l	
205:25 212:1		25:13 25:20 27:5 27:6	27:4 51:24				l	
without [5]	67:10	54:16 56:16	57:8				l	
77:6 84:25 122:5	114:1	58:24 59:11	62:21				l	
withstand [1]	111.16	63:2 126:9	135:22	1			Ì	
witnessed [1]	111:16	151:3 151:6	216:7					
Witnessed [1] Women [1]	131:13	yard[1] 114:19	100 -				1	:
	3:2 54:0	Yardis [3]	130:18					
wonder [2] 79:21	54:9	133:20 133:23					l	
		CIATES DE						T